DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 213 109 EA 014 410

AUTHOR Evans, David R.
TITLE The Planning of Nonformal Education. Fundamentals of Educational Planning--30.
INSTITUTION United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Paris (France). International Inst. for Educational Planning.
SPONS AGENCY Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA).
REPORT NO ISBN-92-803-1082-8
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 106p.
AVAILABLE FROM IIEP Publications, International Institute for Educational Planning, 7-9, rue Eugene-Delacroix, 75016 Paris, FRANCE (Order No. R.59; 15.00 francs). Also available in French edition.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Basic Education; Community Development; Community Education; *Comparative Education; *Developing Nations; Economically Disadvantaged; *Educational Change; *Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Lifelong Learning; *Nonformal Education; Social Change

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this monograph is to provide guidelines for planners who are working with current problems in nonformal education. A typology proposed defines nonformal education as ranging from those activities organized outside the formal system to those in which nonformal education is part of the educational system. An overview is given of the variety of nonformal educational activities that exist in the major areas of the Third World. This is followed by a discussion of the rule of nonformal education in development. The next section focuses on the planning task itself. Criteria are suggested that will help in selecting the amount and type of planning appropriate for different kinds of nonformal education. A series of goals, activities, and structures are suggested for a decentralized and differentiated planning process for nonformal education at the national, regional, and program levels. Some critical planning issues are examined in the context of four different categories of nonformal education activities: school-based learning centers, nonformal youth programs, adult basic education and community development, and vocational skill training. (Author/MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Fundamentals of educational planning

ED213109

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Hall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FA 014 410

Included in the series:*

1. *What is Educational Planning?*
   Philip H. Coombs
2. *The Relation of Educational Plans to Economic and Social Planning*
   R. Poignant
3. *Educational Planning and Human Resource Development*
   F. Harbison
4. *Planning and the Educational Administrator*
   C. E. Beeby
5. *The Social Context of Educational Planning*
   C. A. Anderson
6. *The Costing of Educational Plans*
   J. Vaizey, J. D. Chesswas
7. *The Problems of Rural Education*
   V. L. Griffiths
8. *Educational Planning: The Adviser's Role*
   Adam Curle
9. *Demographic Aspects of Educational Planning*
   Ta Ngoc Châu
10. *The Analysis of Educational Costs and Expenditure*
    J. Hallak
11. *The Professional Identity of the Educational Planner*
    Adam Curle
12. *The Conditions for Success in Educational Planning*
    G. C. Ruscoe
13. *Cost-benefit Analysis in Educational Planning*
    Maureen Woodhall
14. *Educational Planning and Unemployed Youth*
    Archibald Callaway
15. *The Politics of Educational Planning in Developing Countries*
    C. D. Rowley
16. *Planning Education for a Plural Society*
    Chai Hon-Chan
17. *Planning the Primary School Curriculum in Developing Countries*
    H. W. R. Hawes
18. *Planning Educational Assistance for the Second Development Decade*
    H. M. Phillips
19. *Study Abroad and Educational Development*
    William D. Carter
20. *Realistic Educational Planning*
    K. R. McKinnon
21. *Planning Education in Relation to Rural Development*
    G. M. Coverdale
22. *Alternatives and Decisions in Educational Planning*
    John D. Montgomery
23. *Planning the School Curriculum*
    Arieh Lewy
24. *Cost Factors in Planning Educational Technological Systems*
    Dean T. Jamison
25. *The Planner and Lifelong Education*
    Pierre Furter
26. *Education and Employment: a Critical Appraisal*
    Martin Carnoy
27. *Planning Teacher Demand and Supply*
    Peter Williams
28. *Planning Early Childhood Care and Education in Developing Countries*
    Alastair Heron
29. *Communication Media in Education for Low-Income Countries*
    Emile G. McAnany and John K. Mayo
30. *The Planning of Nonformal Education*
    David R. Evans

* Also published in French. Other titles to appear

The planning of nonformal education

David R. Evans

Paris 1981
Unesco: International Institute for Educational Planning

4

The Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA)
has provided financial assistance for the publication of this booklet

Published in 1981 by the United Nations
Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
7 Place de Fontenoy, 75700 Paris
Printed by Ceuterick, Louvain

Cover design by Bruno Pfäffli
ISBN 92-803-1082-8

© Unesco 1981
Printed in Belgium

Fundamentals of educational planning

The booklets in this series are written primarily for two types of clientele: those engaged in—or preparing for—educational planning and administration, especially in developing countries; and others, less specialized, such as senior government officials and policy-makers who seek a more general understanding of educational planning and of how it is related to overall national development. They are devised to be of use either for private study or in formal training programmes.

Since this series was launched in 1967 the practice as well as the concept of educational planning has undergone substantial change. Many of the assumptions which underlay earlier attempts to put some rationality into the process of educational development have been abandoned or at the very least criticized. At the same time, the scope of educational planning itself has been broadened. In addition to the formal system of schools, it now includes other important educational efforts in non-formal settings and among adults. Attention to the growth and expansion of educational systems is being supplemented and sometimes even replaced by a growing concern for the distribution of educational opportunities and benefits across different regions and across social, ethnic and sex groups. The planning, implementation and evaluation of innovations and reforms in the content and substance of education is becoming at least as important a preoccupation of educational planners and administrators as the forecasting of the size of the educational system and its output. Moreover, the planning process itself is changing, giving more attention to the

implementation and evaluation of plans as well as to their design, and exploring such possibilities as integrated planning, participatory planning, and micro-planning.

One of the purposes of these booklets is to reflect this diversity by giving different authors, coming from a wide range of backgrounds and disciplines, the opportunity to express their ideas and to communicate their experience on various aspects of changing theories and practices in educational planning.

Although the series has been carefully planned, no attempt has been made to avoid differences or even contradictions in the views expressed by the authors. The Institute itself does not wish to impose any official doctrine on any planner. Thus, while the views are the responsibility of the authors and may not always be shared by Unesco or the IIEP, they are believed to warrant attention in the international forum of ideas.

Since readers will vary so widely in their backgrounds, the authors have been given the difficult task of introducing their subjects from the beginning, explaining technical terms that may be commonplace to some but a mystery to others, and yet adhering to scholarly standards. This approach will have the advantage, it is hoped, of making the booklets optimally useful to every reader.

Preface

In this work, David Evans analyses the planning of nonformal education and its contribution to overall development.

The concept and scope of "nonformal education" requires clarification and D. Evans proposes a typology from one extreme which defines nonformal education as those activities organised outside the formal system to the other extreme in which nonformal education is part of the whole integrated concept of the educational system. He puts some emphasis on the recent forms of a decentralised, participatory type, involving the work of communal organisations and private associations, giving more importance to actions at the local level, but at the same time, creating more complexity in the problems of articulation between nonformal educational planning and the educational system in general which takes account of national development objectives.

The booklet is directed as much at practitioners as at planners. For the former group, it presents the most significant experiences; for the second, it proposes categories for analysis and suggests more efficient methodologies and techniques. The different levels of development of nonformal education in the diverse regions of the world may give the possibility of drawing meaningful comparisons from the national experiences. In reviewing these experiences, the author emphasizes the factors which planners should take into consideration, difficulties which have been encountered; he selects valuable references on the existing literature and on the specialised institutions active in this field in different parts of the world.

The conclusion which the author finally reaches is that this field requires perhaps only a flexible planning, which should be linked qualitatively to the special nature and diversity of programmes; but in any case, it should be appropriately articulated with the planning of the rest of the educational system in order to be able to respond efficiently and opportunely, according to the aims and circumstances of nonformal educational programmes.

It is hoped that this booklet will lead planners to a better understanding of the specific characteristics and requirements of nonformal education, and will provide a useful source of information on this crucial component of any development strategy.

Michel Debeauvais
Director, IIEP

Contents

I. Introduction 11

II. Nonformal education: its origins and meanings 17

III. Approaches to planning nonformal education 59

IV. Finding further information 98

Acknowledgement

The author wishes to acknowledge a considerable debt to the many people who have been working and writing in the field of nonformal out-of-school education. Particular thanks must go to the practitioners in the field whose activities and experience form the most important part of the knowledge in the subject. Much of the current understanding and insight into the nature of nonformal education comes from work in the developing countries, work which is now informing efforts in both developed and developing societies. Any effort such as this monograph of necessity draws heavily on these experiences and could not be written without the efforts of the practitioners.

Since this monograph was written to be self-contained, the normal footnotes and academic references have not been included. The bibliography is constructed with the dual criteria of usefulness and availability. As a result many of the important contributors to ideas reflected in the monograph are not specifically mentioned.

The author wants to express gratitude for the considerable editorial assistance provided by David Kahler, and the thoughtful comments on the original manuscript by Manzoor Ahmed. The author is also indebted to A. N. Boma, Pierre Furter, Arthur Gillette, Father D. Mbunda, and W. K. Medlin for their constructive suggestions on the document. The limitations of the final version remain the responsibility of the author.

I. Introduction

Nonformal education[1] presents a challenging problem for today's educational planners. The diversified nature of the activities included in nonformal education poses difficult questions for those wishing to apply systematic traditional educational planning procedures to this field. What purposes can and should nonformal education serve? What educational activities should be included? How should these activities be related to formal education? Can nonformal education be effectively planned, and if so, in what ways and by whom? With increasing attention and resources being given to nonformal education in many countries today, the competencies of educational planners must be developed and expanded to include effective methods of working in this area of educational planning.

Is nonformal education a new activity for mankind or is it a case of old wine in new bottles? If one looks at the historical record of mankind's efforts to educate its numbers, the role of the various educational processes can be seen in a better perspective. For the great bulk of history, education was carried on by informal processes which were integrated into the fabric of daily life. The language, behaviour and values needed to become an effective member of society were learned from a range of individuals in the community. The major learning modes were imitation combined with learning by doing. The specialized skills which were

1. The term 'nonformal' education has been used synonymously with 'out-of-school' education in this monograph. A discussion of the issues involved in the definition of the term nonformal education can be found in Chapter II.

needed were taught through informal apprenticeship schemes. Formal schools arrived quite late in man's history, and only in the last several hundred years in European history has there been an effort at schooling more than a very small percentage of the population. The era of universal schooling is even more recent, dating back not much more than fifty years in the most developed countries. The pattern is similar for the newer nations except that the history of schooling is shorter and the era of universal schooling is still being planned for the future in most places.

Yet in both developed and developing countries, there is now a growing awareness that in some ways the limits of formal education have been reached and that there are many educational tasks for which schools are not the best vehicle. Experience in the most developed nations indicates that even when the resources are available to ask schools to undertake most of the educational tasks, a number of these tasks cannot be effectively carried out by the schools. Planners in a wide variety of settings are coming to realize that an effective national educational system must be a mixture of in-school and out-of-school educational processes.

The historical pattern of educational efforts can thus be seen in a very broad perspective as consisting of three phases: the predominantly non-school approaches which characterize most of man's history; the relatively short current period in which education is dominated by formal schools; and the initial stages of a future pattern in which nonformal education will exist in partnership with school education. The recent adoption by Unesco of the term and the concept of lifelong education sets the stage for this more general perception of educational processes. In this framework the planning of nonformal education becomes a process which must take place in the context of planning for the complete range of educational activities in the society. The educational system then becomes a diversified set of activities serving all ages in the population by providing opportunities to learn a variety of content using different methods. Peoples' style of learning and the content which they need to learn change over their lifetimes. The more recent concepts of education envision a series of activities which could serve these needs.

However, planning for such a comprehensive system is a formidable task. The recent attention given to nonformal education has led to a proliferation of overlapping terms and concepts. The

literature contains lengthy discussions of nonformal educational activities under a wide variety of ill-defined terms: adult education, literacy training, basic education, fundamental education, community-based education, and nonformal education. Underlying the confusion of terms are conceptual confusions deriving from the many different ways of categorizing and describing educational activities which take place outside the school.

Compounding the definitional issues are the more basic issues stemming from a lack of understanding of the characteristics of different types of educational efforts. Which ones are most appropriate for a given set of learners in a given situation? What resource and organizational inputs lead to specific kinds of educational outputs? Answers to these typical planning questions at the moment primarily take the form of untested assumptions or hypotheses about relationships. The planning task is thus really a double undertaking: to carry out the basic research which will provide a solid understanding of the characteristics of various forms of nonformal education, and to devise planning techniques to make optimal use of these educational activities.

Planning of nonformal education will be increasingly necessary because of the current thrust towards decentralization of the development process, and a growing awareness of the importance of participation in this process. Evidence is mounting that the process of development, particularly in rural areas, can only proceed so far without significantly increased amounts of direct participation by the inhabitants of the area. Some forms of nonformal education focus directly on the client and the processes which are necessary to provide the skills and the motivation for people to become involved in their own development. Educational programmes range from those directly engaged in raising the 'consciousness' of the people to the redesign of educational planning and administration structures to allow increased local participation and control. The planning procedures required for these new approaches are quite different from the kinds of planning hitherto practised in the formal education system. Designing educational and management structures to initiate, facilitate and incorporate participation presents significant new challenges to the planner. These demands are present in both formal and nonformal educational settings, but they are most central in nonformal educational activities.

Planning for nonformal education involves a series of other critical issues as well. How can nonformal education be developed so that it does not constitute a lower-quality, second-class alternative to formal schooling? Can societies tolerate a dual educational system which tends to reinforce the division of society into groups of different economic and social status? Dealing with this problem may require fairly substantial changes in the formal education system as well. Policy-makers and planners may have to reassess the role of all kinds of education in development.

Much of the activity in nonformal education has been developed by the non-governmental sector. Private voluntary organizations, religious bodies, and community groups have sponsored much of what exists today. What are the prospects for further development of these efforts? What are the limitations of such programmes? How do public and private programmes in nonformal education co-ordinate and co-operate with each other? Should government financial assistance be given to private efforts and if so, will that undermine some of the independence of these programmes? Will government planning and control of nonformal education tend to reduce their effectiveness and their responsiveness to local needs?

Who should pay the costs of nonformal education—the user or society? Should the user pay the costs of nonformal education when much of the cost of formal education is paid by society? Again, the issues of social equity and distribution of opportunities and resources arise. Are nonformal educational programmes really cheaper, so that resource-poor countries can use nonformal education to reach the rural poor?

As this quick review of issues indicates, the problems are diverse and extensive. Answers to all these questions are not available. But a good deal of experience has been gained in recent years and the issues are clearer. Some answers exist and a better understanding of the dynamics of nonformal education in the context of national development is evolving. The chapters which follow are intended to share the current state of knowledge and understanding.

The purpose of this monograph is to provide guidelines for planners who are working with current problems in nonformal education. As the field of nonformal education is relatively new, Chapter II begins with a discussion of the different historical roots

underlying nonformal education today. The second section focuses on the issues of definition with the goal of providing the reader with a workable conceptual framework for understanding both the entire area of human learning and a specific set of limits for the task of planning nonformal education. Emphasis is placed on a series of analytic dimensions which are particularly helpful for programme-planning efforts.

The third section of the chapter provides a quick overview of the variety of nonformal educational activities which exist in the major areas of the Third World. The examples will help the reader get a more concrete understanding of what is meant by nonformal education. The chapter closes with a discussion of the role of nonformal education in development. This is one of the most important and the most difficult sets of issues in the whole field of nonformal education. Political and social issues interact with the more technical planning issues to produce some painful dilemmas. Included in this section are the perspectives of some of the critics of nonformal education as well.

Central to this discussion are the issues of social justice, educational reform and structural change in society. Part of the attractiveness of nonformal education to the development community has been the hope that by dealing primarily with the poor and often neglected sectors of the population it could effect significant improvement in their status. The combination of service to disadvantaged populations and the promise of reform has sparked much of the dialogue about nonformal education. Can nonformal education deliver on these promises or are these false hopes? Planners need a clear picture of both sides of this debate.

Chapter III focuses on the planning task itself. The chapter begins with a discussion of some of the concerns about expanding planning to include nonformal education. The second section suggests criteria which will help in selecting the amount and type of planning which may be appropriate for different kinds of nonformal education. The three sections that follow set out a series of goals, activities and suggested structures for a decentralized and differentiated planning process for nonformal education. The first two levels deal with system planning, and the lowest level focuses on programme planning, although detailed aspects of programme planning are outside the scope of this monograph.

The remainder of the chapter looks at some of the critical

planning issues in the context of four different categories of nonformal education activities. The categories are presented to focus attention on some of the more common types of existing programmes. The actual planning process which is recommended, however, proceeds not from categories but from an analysis of needs and resources.

The final section of the chapter looks at the costs of nonformal education. Planners will find significant cautions to temper the original enthusiasm about the low cost of nonformal education. Costs can be kept low only if certain types of educational strategies are followed. These strategies are appropriate for some kinds of educational outcomes and not for others.

The amount of planning and the role of the planner will vary with different models of nonformal education. A more definitive version of the future will have to wait until those readers who are actively involved in planning create for themselves some of these alternative futures. Their activities will then form the experience upon which another, and perhaps more complete, set of planning guidelines might be based. Thus in a very real sense, the development of planning processes for nonformal education is, at the moment, a participative process of trial and error. The monograph as a whole will have served its purpose if readers are able to take confidence and direction from the summary of current knowledge and build a more effective set of procedures for the future.

II. Nonformal education: its origins and its meanings

Out-of-school education, in its most general form, has always been present in all societies. Each society develops socialization processes to familiarize youth with the *mores* and the rules of the society. These processes use various structures ranging from completely informal learning as a part of everyday life to more structured ceremonies associated with the transition from one age-status in society to another. The term indigenous education is often applied to these educational processes.

Indigenous education is still alive today. Many societies retain initiation ceremonies, with varying degrees of instruction in the beliefs of the society. These range from a few days of informal preparation to longer periods of time where the youth are taken off to 'schools' for special instruction. Indigenous education activities are often related to religious instruction. The most widespread examples are the various forms of the Koranic school which exist throughout the Islamic world and the kinds of instruction offered by the Buddhist *wats* in south-east Asia. Supplementing these more general, indigenous instructional methods are the widespread variants of apprenticeship systems, particularly those relating to the healing of the sick and the practice of traditional crafts.

What are the roots of nonformal education?

Indigenous education forms the general historical foundation upon which today's reawakened interest in nonformal education is based. The study of indigenous modes of education is motivated

in part by the search for national identities by new nations, and by the desire to create educational processes which reflect unique cultural roots. However, relatively little practical programming has emerged so far from such study, although indigenous education has provided inspiration and a source of names for programmes which at least stress the symbolic linkage between the new and the old.

The current dialogue on nonformal education can be traced to three more recent roots, all of which emerge from the needs of new nations to provide education for all sectors of their societies. An awareness of these roots will help provide planners with a basis for integrating the widely divergent writings in the field of nonformal education into a more coherent whole. Knowledge of the roots will also help planners decide which approaches might have relevance to the problems faced by their own countries.

The three roots can be characterized by the following labels: the *practitioners of nonformal education*, the international *educational planners* and the *critics of schooling*. The first group consists of that large body of practitioners who have for decades worked to improve the health, the economic livelihood and the education of the impoverished people of the world. The second group is relatively small but quite influential at policy-making levels. This group evolved more recently as development specialists who have faced the crisis in the capability of formal educational systems to contribute effectively to development. Joining these two groups in the middle and late 1960s is the work of Illich and Freire and the other critics of schooling and its role in development. Working from ideological and social-justice perspectives, the writings of the critics added an element of conflict and dialogue to an otherwise technical literature and expanded the discussions to involve a wider spectrum of intellectuals and social scientists.

Although the nonformal education label and the discussion of it are known to readers mostly through the writings of the planners and the critics, the primary basis for the reality of nonformal education lies in the long decades of efforts of the practitioners. Historically, this group of *practitioners of nonformal education* and their activities have been described by a wide variety of labels: adult education, literacy, functional literacy, farmer education, co-operative education, agricultural extension, population education, family-life planning, nutrition education, and community develop-

ment education. In addition there is a whole complex of activities related to youth including work camps, national and international voluntary service schemes, and scouting in all its various forms. For several decades these activities have been supported by a wide variety of international assistance bodies such as Unesco, Unicef, FAO and ILO, to mention only a few. In addition the private voluntary organizations have often taken the lead in creating and supporting such programmes on the national and the local level.

The list is only partial, but it does serve to illustrate the extensive experiential base upon which the field of nonformal education rests. A look at any specific project labelled either nonformal or out-of-school education today will reveal an activity which could just as easily be described by one or other of the terms used above. The accumulated practical knowledge of these efforts accounts for the great majority of the techniques being employed in nonformal education today.

To discuss the wide variety of activities under this root from a planning perspective will require some scheme which helps to group similar nonformal education activities together. There are many such schemes, several of which will be discussed in the monograph. One simple approach which will be used in this section is to group activities according to their relationship to formal schools. More accurately, the scheme classifies activities according to the relationship which the clients have or did have with formal schools. Since current practices in educational planning usually work with populations defined in relationship to schools, such a categorization provides an easy basis from which to shift emphasis away from schools.

The scheme is based on three general categories: *complementary* education, which rounds out the school curriculum; *supplementary* education, which adds on to schooling at a later time and place; and education which *replaces* schooling. A fourth category may be emerging in the future in which formal and nonformal education merge into a unified process of education which is available throughout the lives of learners. However, since this discussion focuses primarily on the historical roots of nonformal education, only the first three categories will be used.

Complementary education. This type of nonformal education normally complements or *completes* the education offered by the formal school system. The clientèle are generally students who are

concurrently enrolled in primary or secondary education. Complementary education normally involves learning which because of its content or the type of activities required is inappropriate for the classroom setting of schools. The physical closeness of the activity to the school varies. Some activities like sports clubs, hobby groups, debating societies, drama or choral groups and the like are usually school-based and school-supervised. These activities provide the non-classroom component of the formal school curriculum.

More generally included under the heading of nonformal education are those activities which may or may not use school facilities, but which are organized and supervised by non-school personnel or organizations. Included in this category would be the wide variety of youth organizations like scouting, young farmers' clubs, and voluntary-service activities which are often sponsored by private organizations. Current trends strongly reinforce the complementary category as schools broaden the concept of appropriate school curriculum and move to involve the school more directly in the community. There is an increasing emphasis on comprehensive school approaches which often include work-study components where students work in community settings. The latter is intended both to provide learning opportunities and sometimes to contribute directly to production. There is a movement by education officials towards the position that some education should take place outside the schools, particularly in societies where traditional school activities are felt to promote elitist attitudes and a disinclination to become involved in the physical-labour aspects of development.

These emerging trends in complementary education are part of a larger movement of deschooling education. However, planners should be aware of the implications of placing too great an emphasis on the complementary category, in that it primarily serves a clientèle which is already in a favoured position. Complementary education provides few opportunities for that sector of the school-age population, or the adult population, which has not had access to the formal school system. In any development scheme these are priority clientèles and they might be better served by other categories of nonformal education.

Supplementary education. This category of nonformal education usually comes later in life, after whatever amount of formal edu-

cation a person has completed, and serves to *add on* to the learning produced in school settings. In many cases, these activities take the form of training for primary school leavers. Included here would be a large range of apprenticeships, skill-training programmes, farmer-training courses and family or home economics training. The content is normally linked to specific practical situations and involves learners in developing skills which will be immediately applicable in their life situation.

Typical of this group would be the Botswana Brigade system whose intake is selected from that large body of primary school leavers who are unable to find places in the next level of the formal school system. The brigades specialize in skills such as building or farming or leather tanning. The activities combine a small core of general education with skill training and with productive application of that skill. The student's work is intended to offset the recurrent costs of the operation as well as to provide training. The brigades are an imaginative form of supplementary education which contains the basic element of skill training normally found in the wide range of skill and craft courses offered for non-school populations throughout the developing world. Supplementary education often includes drop-outs from secondary school, and increasingly even those who completed secondary school but can find no employment.

From a planning point of view, one should note that supplementary nonformal education also primarily serves the favoured section of the population, namely those who have already benefited from some participation in the formal educational system. Because of the potentially difficult political problems that can be raised by unemployed school leavers, however, the pressures to provide some activities for this group are often very strong. Planners will find it necessary to balance these pressures against the need to provide opportunity to those who have had little or no formal education.

Replacement education. The third category of nonformal education activities includes those which replace or *substitute* for formal education. These programmes serve both children and adults who for whatever reason do not have access to formal schooling. A typical example would be basic-literacy courses which are often attended by a mixture of unschooled children and adults. The clientèle in this category tends to be people who live in isolated

rural areas, possibly inaccessible at certain seasons of the year, nomadic people, or people in poor, undeveloped sections of the country. Often they may also be members of ethnic groups which for various reasons have had less access to schooling opportunities. In some cases this type of nonformal education provides a stepping-stone for people moving into the formal system.

The content of such programmes tends to focus on basic skills of literacy and numeracy, and on low-level skills in practical subjects like health, nutrition and agriculture. Sponsorship of the programmes, with the exception perhaps of literacy, is likely to be outside the Ministry of Education and in many cases is non-governmental. Programmes tend to be short in duration, three months to a year, and often have a considerable fluctuation in both attendance and in levels of skill produced in participants. Teachers are often primary school teachers working after school or volunteers with relatively little training. Programmes are frequently financed at low levels and generally have uncertain futures.

This category is the one which attracted the attention of planners to nonformal education. Nonformal education offered the promise of feasible and low-cost methodologies for reaching that growing group of people who are now being served by formal education and who had little prospect of being served in the near future. But using nonformal education to replace formal education raises some serious issues. It amounts to attempting to serve a significant proportion of the population while using only a very small part of the resources being devoted to education in the country. Critics rightly argue that the degree of quality of education which can be provided this way is not a comparable substitute for primary education, and in effect represents a very poor, second-class kind of education for the disadvantaged parts of the population. For the planner, then, the difficult question becomes, in the short run, a choice between no services or the provision of simple basic education at a low level, for a large part of the population of developing countries.

Whether acting to complement, supplement or replace formal education, the practitioner of nonformal education has formed the backbone of the efforts to carry out education beyond school walls. These activities have gone on for many years with little visibility, low resources and low priority from the point of view of the planner immersed in the demands of the formal school sys-

tem. A radical change in this situation has come about primarily by the efforts of two other groups which form the two additional roots of nonformal education today.

The second root in the development of nonformal education evolved from the efforts of the international *educational planners*. Their awakening to the field of nonformal education dates from the late 1960s and the publication of a conference document entitled *The world educational crisis: a systems analysis*, written by Philip Coombs, which articulated the dissatisfaction with the formal school system in the developing world and stressed the rapidly approaching limits to further expansion. The book forcefully highlighted the financial implications of further expansion of schools and made quite apparent the unreality of expectations that schooling could be expanded to serve the large unschooled populations of the Third World. Interest in nonformal education as a potential solution to this crisis grew quickly, particularly among international assistance organizations. Several agencies sponsored a series of research and development studies and soon began to formulate projects and plans to field-test activities that were felt to exemplify the nonformal educational approach.

Interest in nonformal education has continued to grow among planners and development specialists at universities, in international agencies and in ministries of education. Initial efforts focused on two tasks: first, to define what was and what was not meant by nonformal education; and second, to find, describe, analyse and in some way codify the wide range of examples of out-of-school or nonformal education projects to be found throughout the developing world. Given the academic background of most of the writers the first focus was predictable. Considerable debate and some progress was made towards clarifying possible alternative meanings of the term. The outcome of the debate has some relevance for planners and will be treated in the next section of this chapter.

The collection of cases produced more extensive and probably more valuable results. Several major efforts were undertaken to collect case studies, analyse them and produce categorization schemes that would help to define nonformal education from a practitioner's point of view. The earliest of these efforts was carried out by the African-American Institute and resulted in the book *Non-formal education in African development* (1972) in which

are presented more than eighty short case studies from tropical Africa.

Projects were analysed and categorized loosely as: industrial and vocational, agricultural and community development, programmes aimed at out-of-school rural youth, and programmes for rural adults. A fifth residual category was included for multipurpose programmes that did not fit into the first four groups. As the authors, Sheffield and Diejomaoh, indicate, the categories are defined by a mixture of programme content, age of target population and location of the project—urban or rural. Although the cases are brief, the study is useful because it represents the first systematic attempt to collect and compare a wide variety of nonformal education projects. Planners will find it helpful because it introduces a sense of the variety of design alternatives which are available as possible models for nonformal education.

Other sets of case studies were undertaken by the International Council for Educational Development for Unicef and the World Bank and resulted in the publication of a book entitled *Education for rural development* (1975). The seventeen studies in this book offer considerable descriptive and analytical detail. The editors, Manzoor Ahmed and Philip Coombs, provide a rough classification of seven categories according to the predominant learning objectives of each programme. Classification could also be done according to the characteristics of the major clientèle served. In each case, issues of organization, staffing and training activities are discussed and the general developmental context in which the project exists is presented. Particularly valuable for planners is the summary analysis, which places heavy emphasis on the need for co-ordinated approaches to development in contrast to efforts which place primary focus on education alone as the source of development. The level of detail and analysis makes this collection a useful resource for planners for judging the relevance of a particular approach to their own situations.

Currently analysis of examples of nonformal education has moved away from international collections and is focusing on surveys of activities within particular countries or subregions of countries. These are typified by the national surveys carried out in Asia under the auspices of the South-East Asian Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO) and a particularly thorough effort recently completed by the Centre for the Development of

Nonformal Education (CEDEN), a national research organization in Colombia, South America. The survey approach allows planners to get a complete look at the range of activities in a particular area, and at the same time provides valuable data for understanding the nature of the total complex of educational efforts available to learners in the area. Such a mapping exercise provides an opportunity for systematic planning and co-ordination of the entire educational sector. The educational planners have succeeded in raising awareness of the non-school sector of education and in providing a strong research base for further development. Their writings continue to form the basic resources for planners in countries where the interest in nonformal education is high.

The third root of the current nonformal education effort can be traced to the group of *critics of schooling*, whose writings have become increasingly well known since the late 1960s. A major force is the work of Ivan Illich, who has forcefully presented the case against schools as institutions for development. His writings make clear his opposition to attempts to reform schools, which he advocates replacing completely with learning webs composed of skill-exchanges, peer-matching systems and reference services to educational objects and personnel. He envisions education as part of a new social order which replaces consumption for its own sake with the meaningful interaction of men. For him, education must be a liberating force controlled by the learner and not an institution which subordinates man to society.

Writing at the same time, with equal influence, Paulo Freire has stimulated world-wide interest and discussion about the oppressive nature of formal education. In contrast to Illich, Freire focused on developing a theoretical model for understanding the process by which formal education, among other institutions, served to oppress the very people it was meant to aid. His work prompted efforts by numerous followers to develop practical, field-based means for countering oppression and beginning a process of dialogue which would free the oppressed. Although he never directly mentions nonformal or out-of-school education, the techniques used by his followers in the field provide a range of stimulating and creative models for the education of illiterates. His concept of 'consciousness' has become a working tool for many nonformal educators and has created a totally new type of goal for educational projects. For some workers in the field of

nonformal education, projects which do not include the raising of consciousness as a goal are considered neither viable nor ethical. For them, development cannot result from educational efforts which do not influence the learner's critical consciousness of his or her life and environment.

Taken together, the writings of these two seminal thinkers and their followers have exerted a profound influence on the other two roots from which nonformal education has emerged. The possibility of a planned nonformal education sector appealed to planners, while the vision of an inexpensive and effective means of educating the rural masses intrigued economists concerned about the financial crisis implicit in expanding formal education. At the same time, the vision of the critics who sought increased social justice and a humane, unoppressive educational process appealed to substantial numbers of the development community who had become disenchanted with development in the form of capitalist-oriented economic systems striving for ever greater GNP per capita, but failing visibly to effect better distribution of the benefits of such development. Finally, the traditional nonformal educators were emboldened by a movement that, for the first time, saw major international development agencies discussing the role of non-school educational activities as essential components of development and therefore worthy of investment.

The combination of these three roots and their interaction resulted in a quick rise in the popularity of nonformal education and a tremendous outpouring of documents and discussion on its importance and place in promoting development. For planners, the result has been pressure from external agencies and from their own ministries to begin a process of planning for nonformal education in order to take advantage of its benefits and to see that efforts are co-ordinated within the educational sector and with other developmental sectors. In order to begin such an assignment, planners were everywhere faced with the task of deciding what activities to include within the scope of out-of-school or nonformal education.

What is the meaning of nonformal education?

Unfortunately, the resulting widespread dialogue did relatively little to promote clarity in terms of a useful understanding of the

meaning of the term nonformal education, or of a clear understanding of what could be expected from nonformal education in particular kinds of development situations. An extended debate exists in the literature on the ways in which the universe of educational activities might be carved up into pieces of varying size. Even the terms nonformal education and out-of-school education, which are being used synonymously in this monograph, have overlapping and conflicting definitions in the literature. The brief discussion which follows is intended to provide planners with a useful set of concepts which will facilitate planning activities. The debate in the literature is useful primarily for those interested in constructing theoretical frameworks for analysis. Useful resolution of the theoretical discussion may only come about as the result of inputs from the practitioners as they go about the task of solving educational problems in feasible ways.

As the terms nonformal and out-of-school indicate, the initial definition was basically in terms of *what it was not*. There was some logic to this approach because the initial task was to raise awareness of the potential, and more important the legitimacy, of non-school educational efforts. Hence early efforts stressed the differences between schooling and out-of-school educational activities. With official endorsement of the movement by major international agencies in the early seventies, that goal was achieved, and efforts turned to the more challenging task of creating working definitions that would promote effective utilization of nonformal education.

The definition proposed by Coombs[1] and his co-workers has come to be generally accepted. They define nonformal education as:

> ... any organized educational activity outside the established formal system—whether operating separately or as an important feature of some broader activity—that is intended to serve identifiable clienteles and learning objectives.

The definition retains the aspects of non-school, presumably meaning an activity different from regular classroom instruction and the normal range of school activities. Three other characteris-

1. P. Coombs *et al.*, *New paths to learning for rural children and youths*, p. 11, 1973.

tics are stressed as being necessary for inclusion in the definition: nonformal education must be an *organised* activity for an identifiable clientèle, and with the purpose of achieving a *specified set of learning objectives.* These criteria may exclude some educational activities that the popular literature would include in nonformal education, but the limits imposed by the definition are useful in helping planners set limits on the scope of activities for which they wish to take some responsibility.

The process of defining nonformal education stimulates an analysis of the entire range of educational situations in an attempt to differentiate between formal schooling and other activities. A variety of schemes were suggested to divide the spectrum of learning settings into a number of categories. One such scheme, proposed by a working group at Michigan State University, uses four categories, which are defined as:

Incidental education—learning which takes place without either a conscious attempt to present on the part of the source or a conscious attempt to learn on the part of the learner.

Informal education—learning results from situations where *either* the learner *or* the source of information has a conscious intent of promoting learning—but *not both.*

Nonformal (out-of-school) education—any non-school learning where *both* the source *and* the learner have conscious intent to promote learning.

Formal (school) education—which differs from nonformal education by its location within institutions called schools, which are characterized by the use of age-graded classes of youth being taught a fixed curriculum by a cadre of certified teachers using standard pedagogical methods.

These four categories provide a comprehensive conceptual framework which includes all learning activities of human beings. In terms of the total set of knowledge and attitudes possessed by an adult, even a well-schooled adult, the great majority of an individual's total learning takes place in the incidental and informal categories. Consider the learning of language, culturally specified behaviours, general attitudes and beliefs, and most functional knowledge about daily life. Almost none of that learning takes place in intentionally structured teaching-learning environments. Most such learning takes place by a combination of observation, imitation and selective reinforcement by other members of soci-

ety. The term incidental education covers this whole array of learning settings in which neither the learner nor the 'teacher' consciously structures the encounter for the purpose of having learning take place.

Informal education refers to learning which results from conscious efforts either on the part of the learner to learn from the environment or on the part of an individual or organization with intent to create a learning situation, but without a specific set of individual learners in mind. Thus educational radio messages broadcast to the general public have the intent of teaching, but may or may not find listeners who are willing or able to learn from the message. Or, a learner who wants to learn more about auto mechanics may ask questions of a friend who is a mechanic or spend time around a garage and watch cars being repaired. Here the learner has a clear intention, but the situations are not being structured with the intent of promoting learning. Informal learning provides an important avenue for self-improvement on the part of learners who do not have the opportunity to attend school. Such people are often referred to as being self-taught.

The border between informal and nonformal is marked by situations where *both* the learner *and* the 'teacher' are consciously seeking to promote learning. Thus when educational radio broadcasts are combined with structured listening groups, the activity is clearly in the category of nonformal education. When a young man becomes an apprentice with an experienced auto mechanic, both individuals recognize the intent of the apprentice to learn, and both will take action to encourage that learning. The border between informal and nonformal can occasionally be unclear, as for instance when a learner consciously seeks out an educational radio programme, or when an adult goes to the library and takes out a book on brick-making in order to improve his house. Such instances, however, will be of little concern to educational planners, since such learning situations will normally not be included within the scope of educational planning efforts.

The border between nonformal and formal education is quite clearly marked by the distinction between school and non-school. If an activity is carried on in school by regular teachers as part of the normal curriculum, then it is formal education. If an educational activity is not of this nature, but is intentional on the part of both the learner and the 'teacher', then the activity is classified

as nonformal education. Certain activities may not fall clearly in either the formal or nonformal categories, such as when a school brings in a traditional musician to teach children about their cultural tradition after normal class hours. Again, from the perspective of the planner such cases are of minor concern. The problem for planners is more one of determining how such activities will be organized, supervised and financed, than one of classifying them as either formal or nonformal.

The system of four categories does provide a fairly clear set of boundaries for those concerned with planning nonformal educational activities. Planners should certainly not assume that all forms of learning ought to be planned, and in most cases planners would want to exclude both incidental and informal education from the planning domain. As will be seen in the next chapter, one of the key issues in planning nonformal education is the extent to which planning is appropriate. In dealing with this issue, global concepts like lifelong education, which includes all four of the above categories, are of little help other than providing a general term for the entire sector of activities. However, both the Coombs definition and the fourfold scheme do provide some criteria which may be used to delineate more precisely those areas of educational activity where some form of planning is desirable.

The problem with the attempts at definition, and the creation of taxonomies to catalogue the range of nonformal education approaches, is their basically descriptive nature. Such schemes are developed to describe and analyse existing programmes and to study them. Planners, while benefiting from the results of such efforts, face an essentially different set of tasks: defining educational needs, establishing priorities, allocating scarce resources among competing uses, and designing specific solutions which are feasible within the context of existing constraints. For planners the task is to know what the range of options is, to understand their costs and benefits and to possess a working set of criteria for making choices among the alternatives. Viewed in this light, the definitional issues recede in importance and are replaced by the need for a workable *design process*. Planning is an active, creative and prescriptive activity and requires tools appropriate to that task.

Perceiving these problems, some planners have begun to move away from thinking about nonformal education as if it were a

single entity susceptible to definition. Instead, they have tried to produce an analytic framework of dimensions which will provide planners with a way of both analysing existing programmes and, more important, designing new ones. One of the by-products of this approach is the realization that many of the existing taxonomic schemes are based on the use of only one or two dimensions at the expense of others. What also becomes clear is that the normal curriculum design process for schools is really a limited special case of the more general process of designing learning environments for a particular set of clients, to meet certain learning goals, within the limits of a particular situation. A major contribution of nonformal education is to free planners from the very limited set of alternatives provided by the schooling model and to open a broad new range of design possibilities. Using a set of dimensions can provide planners, especially at the project level, with the basis for systematic design procedures that give serious consideration to the full range of alternatives, and can result in a learning environment, or curriculum in the most general sense, which is the most effective way of meeting educational needs.

What are the basic design questions which must be asked? The answers to these questions become in effect the dimensions of analysis for nonformal educaion. The paragraphs which follow set out such a list of dimensions and include a discussion of the variety of alternatives which exist in each dimension. The examples provided are intended to illustrate the range of variation but are in no way exhaustive of the possibilities. Readers are encouraged to add mentally other examples drawn from their own experience as they study these examples.

Learning objectives. This most basic of dimensions should normally be the primary source of answers to the question, 'Why is an educational programme needed?' However, programmes are often mounted for political and social reasons, in which case the basic question should be about what the *programme* objectives are rather than what the *learning* objectives are. In either case there is likely to be a set of learning goals with or without explicit statements about accompanying non-educational goals. What then are typical educational goals of nonformal education projects?

Perhaps the most common category is that of general education, or what is often now called basic education. Major components of the goals are normally literacy, functional or otherwise, numeracy,

basic health and nutrition, motivation for change and development, and in some cases, critical consciousness raising. This constellation of interlocking objectives is frequently present in a given programme, although primary emphasis is likely to be given to one or other of them depending on the organizational and financial source of the programme. Adult-education programmes under ministry of education auspices typically stress literacy and numeracy. Although other goals may be intended as well, limitations of staff abilities and commonly used pedagogical models may effectively exclude other goals. Conversely, national campaigns to eradicate literacy may in fact place higher priority on associated outcomes such as the motivation of widespread participation on the part of the population or the generation of popular support for a new government or a new national philosophy. In cases of programmes sponsored by ministries of agriculture or rural development, literacy and numeracy may be secondary to the development of an understanding of basic agricultural knowledge, generating commitment to individual and group adoption of new methods of production and marketing, and developing a sense of critical consciousness and self-reliance on the part of participants. Programmes of the latter kind are less common, but often have a high potential for success because of the integrated nature of their approach to the learning needed to promote development.

In addition to learning projects with general education objectives, there are many with more specific goals. Sometimes projects combine general educaion with low levels of occupational training. Good examples of this are offered by programmes for primary school leavers, such as the Village Polytechnics in Kenya. The goals are a combination of maintaining and extending the general skills gained by some formal education and providing specific vocational skills that enable the learners to undertake productive roles in society. Finally one comes to the wide range of programmes that provide more specific skills: agriculture for farmers, crafts and trades for artisans, family-life skills for young women and mothers, and entrepreneurial and mangement skills for small businessmen.

Planners should be aware that one of the basic issues in nonformal education is focused on the question of *how and by whom learning goals should be determined.* Centralized definition and distribution of learning goals for all is basically a characteristic of

formal education and is often inappropriate for nonformal education. Some projects are aimed at developing a process in which a group of learners become able to define their own needs and seek ways of meeting them. Prescription of goals in such settings runs directly counter to the more basic goal of participation and self-reliance. There are times when planners must carefully avoid setting specific learning goals, and substitute instead the goal of producing certain process and learning skills on the part of participants. The balance between predetermined learning goals and process goals depends heavily on the characteristics of the clients, the second major dimension of nonformal education programmes.

Characteristics of the learners. In many planning settings the target group of learners is identified by political or social factors and this sets the initial constraints for the planner. Goals and other aspects of the programme are then derived from the characteristics of the learners. Learners may be specified by age and schooling, as in the case of drop-outs and primary school leavers who are seen as a potential disruptive force. They may be defined by sex and role, as in the case of young women and mothers with young children. Or they may be defined by occupational roles, as farmers, auto mechanics, small businessmen or village leaders, for instance. Clearly, the characteristics of learners are major factors in determining their likely learning needs, prospective locations for learning activities, probable limitations on the timing of training and feasible training methods.

Planners have several options when dealing with learner characteristics. Care should be taken not to fall back unconsciously into the school model, where learners are grouped into homogeneous classes for standardized pedagogical treatment. A major strength of nonformal education is the possibility of heterogeneous groupings of people to provide ranges across age, sex and previous schooling. Heterogeneous groups open up many possibilities for alternate learning strategies in which group members are used as learning resources for other members of the group. Children teaching adults numeracy, grandparents teaching children cultural history, farmers learning from shopkeepers, urban and rural residents learning from each other, husbands learning from wives: all of these are design options which heterogeneous grouping can make possible. Using such strategies, however, will have impor-

tant implications for the selection and training of staff members associated with the programme.

Another set of options relates to the setting of prerequisites or entrance requirements. Highly structured instructional settings usually impose such requirements for entrance, and often have others necessary for continuation in the training. Nonformal educaion can offer the possibility of much more flexible entrance criteria, which allow learners to substitute experience for formal qualifications or entrance on the basis of motivation rather than existing skills. Longer programmes can provide for multiple entrance and exit points, thus allowing people to begin, leave and return later on depending on their needs and other demands on their time. These options can be major assets in helping programmes reach those who otherwise would not attend. Planners should, at each point, ask themselves whether proposed requirements for learners are really necessary and whether the supporting rationale is not more than offset by the advantages to be gained by greater flexibility.

Organizational structure. This dimension covers a range of questions about the internal structure of programmes and the relationships of programmes with larger organizations. The internal organizational issues, dealt with mainly under the dimensions of staffing, learning methods and financing are presented below. The major external organization issue is the relationship to the national ministry of education or other ministry. Choice in this matter has direct implications for both sources of finance and the extent to which educational planning of the programmes should and does take place. There are often considerable advantages in flexibility, local responsiveness and effectiveness to be gained by allowing small programmes to operate completely outside government administration. In some cases association with religious or with voluntary organizations is appropriate, while other programmes may be community sponsored and managed.

Only when substantial amounts of government revenue are to be used or large areas of the country covered should serious consideration be given to having programmes under direct control of the government. When government control is desirable, efforts should be made to delegate most responsibility to regional or district-level officials. These recommendations derive from the importance of flexibility and responsiveness in nonformal educa-

tion activities. In additional, administrative costs are often lowered by simplifying the supervision hierarchy and keeping the administration as localized as possible. Finally, planners should not overlook possibilities for linking nonformal education programmes with other organizations such as the military, industry, commercial agriculture or large-scale development efforts like irrigation or village-settlement programmes. Effective nonformal education programmes can be located in a wide variety of organizational settings and can often benefit from the close interaction which results from association with the other activities of the organization.

Staffing. Staffing is a crucial design issue in nonformal education, particularly because of its impact on costs of programmes. Just as the main cost in formal education is teachers' salaries, so can nonformal education easily be trapped in precisely the same situation unless careful attention is paid to staffing alternatives. One of the characteristics of current nonformal education programmes is widespread use of volunteer and part-time staff members. The initial strategy in many programmes is to add responsibilities to the role of the primary school teachers. The large number of teachers and their distribution throughout urban and rural areas of most countries makes them an attractive potential source of staff. However, there are significant problems as well. Education is not the only development agency to note the importance of the primary school teacher and there are frequent suggestions to add new responsibilities to the teachers' role. Rarely is any of these suggestions accompanied by recommendations for reduction in existing responsibilities or for increases in pay. The results are predictable in most cases—nominal execution of duties with little real impact on non-school activities owing to lack of both time and motivation.

A more promising strategy is based on using a wide variety of people in the community who have no direct association with formal education. Parents, community leaders, artisans, farmers, older pupils both in and out of school, and the members of heterogeneous learning groups themselves form potential sources of staff members. The planning question is one of identification, selection, motivation and support for such staff. Non-traditional sources of staff are probably the single most important new set of resources for nonformal education. If nonformal education is in

fact to deliver on its promise of lower costs, staffing decisions will be the key to success. Planners should be careful to scrutinize most critically any proposals to professionalize the staff by providing training, certificates and, of course, civil-service salaries and benefits. In a short time one would thereby have merely an extension of the formal school system and a comparable set of costs.

Financing. Costs for nonformal education fall into the categories of staff, facilities, transport and expenses for materials and supplies. The staffing issue has already been discussed. The strategy of using existing facilities at times when they are not being otherwise used is very cost-effective and is well known to planners in both the formal and nonformal sectors. Most of the costs for materials and supplies can probably be met by local subscription. Transport can be a more difficult problem, particularly for supervisory and support operations. Some economy can be effected by using local personnel in combination with training in order gradually to reduce the need for supervisory travel.

The major strategy for planners should be to place programmes in such a way as to minimize costs rather than to spend energy trying to find new resources or to increase budget allocations to education. Certainly efforts should be made to tap non-educational organizations wherever possible, and to encourage self-help efforts among the learning community. Raising funds locally usually requires an organizational structure that keeps those finances in the community and provides people with a direct say in how they are used. In general, planners should be aware that costs are heavily dependent on decisions made in the other dimensions of design and the pricing of alternatives should always be an explicit part of the decision process when choices are being made.

Learning methodology. This is a dimension which combines a wide variety of possible alternatives with the extreme difficulty of training educational staff to undertake new kinds of educational roles. The variety of innovative alternatives which exist, and which have been tested in various situations, provides a rich set of design alternatives. These include peer learning, discovery methods, programmed texts, learner-centred curricula, community-based learning, and the whole cluster of media-based educational strategies. The choice of the learning methodology has direct

implications for the kinds of staff needed and the internal structure of the learning settings. These three dimensions should, in reality, be planned together. The choice of learning methodology, or more accurately the mixture of methods chosen, also depends heavily on the learning goals and the characteristics of the learner.

Central to this choice is the issue of the role to be played by the learner in the process and the extent to which he or she will be an active or a passive participant. The major characteristic of the formal schooling model is the teacher-dominated information transfer to the passive pupil. Some nonformal education projects, and particularly those which place emphasis on consciousness raising and the development of active community groups, require methodologies which both encourage and allow the learners to take responsibility for their own learning process. If such designs are chosen initially, planners must devise strategies to counteract the powerful tendency for all educational activities to regress towards the teacher-lecture model. Careful training of programme staff can help to overcome this tendency. However, staff training itself often falls back into a lecture process rather than modelling the desired type of learning methodology.

Locus of control. The issue of control is at the heart of the nature of some kinds of nonformal education and is in part reflected in the issue of the role of the learner in the learning process. Assessment of learning needs, design of the learning methodology, raising and allocating finances, and deciding on the internal organization are all areas which raise the issue of control. The basic question is: who makes decisions for whom and through what mechanisms? The rhetoric of nonformal education, particularly for rural clientèle involved in general education and community-development-type projects, stresses heavily the development of clients' abilities to control what happens to them. Yet the very structure of the programme designed to produce these skills often contradicts this goal because control lies outside the group and the community. Making the structure congruent with the goal of local participation is a particularly challenging design problem for planners.

This issue is at the root of the concern about the appropriateness of any planning on the central or regional level for such programmes. The task for planners is a delicate one of balancing national-level needs against the demands for local control by the

people themselves over programmes which are directly for their benefit. Concepts such as decentralization, participatory structures and systems of representation all form part of this debate. Sorting out the likely behavioural results of alternative organizations and sifting probable reality from political rhetoric provides a significant problem for planners. Planners should be clearly aware that for some nonformal education programmes the issue of control lies at the root of decisions relevant to the other dimensions.

Other dimensions. The seven dimensions provide a reasonable framework for decision-making in the design of nonformal education programmes. There are, of course, other dimensions, and other ways of dividing up the spectrum. Most of the other issues can be treated as part of the ones already discussed. The time dimension of learning, for instance, is closely related to the choice of learning methodology. The issue of time involves both the actual sequencing of learning activities as well as the larger issue of when the learning takes place in the life of the learner. The overall pattern of learning in a country combines all the various learning options both in school and out of school. The timing of education in learners' lives then becomes a matter of individual choice among the range of options offered by the system. Time can also be interpreted to include the degree of immediacy with which the learning can be applied in the learner's life. Both the content of the learning and the location of the structure of learning in relation to employment or social structures influence the likelihood of its application. For some readers these issues might also be discussed as a reward dimension which analyses the kinds and the value of the various rewards produced for the learner by different programme designs. The nature of the timing and the rewards, of course, have strong influence on the type of learners likely to participate, and the extent to which they will be willing to share in some way the cost of the education.

One added advantage of the dimensional approach to nonformal education lies in its ability to shed some light on the confusing terminology used in the literature. The use of these dimensions may serve to clarify the emphasis inherent in many of the terms. Thus both youth and adult education refer to characteristics of the learners, as does rural education. Lifelong education deals with the time frame of education, while out-of-school places stress on the organizational location. Co-operative, farmer and trade-union

education all refer to both clientèle and learning objectives. The term nonformal education places stress either on the learning methodology or the organizational setting, depending on the interests of those using the term. Although more complex and less easily referred to in conversation, the use of dimensions promotes both greater clarity in understanding existing programmes, and, most important, provides a framework for a planning process when one is faced with an educational problem in a particular setting. Planning can become a systematic process rather than a choice between programmes described with labels which only partially indicate the key components of a programme.

Summary. Nonformal education is a definable set of educational activities which can be clearly separated from formal school structures on the one hand, and from the broad range of unstructured learning activities of everyday life on the other. The discussion in the preceding pages has brought into focus the factors which mark those edges. The separation from schooling is fairly evident and is embodied in the non-school setting and organization of the activity. The boundary with informal and incidental educations is marked by the intentional aspect of nonformal education, on the part of both the learner and the source of the learning. As an identifiable set of activities, nonformal education then becomes an arena of educational effort for which some type of planning is possible and probably desirable.

Effective planning, at both the local programme level and at the larger regional and national level, requires that nonformal education should not be treated as a single homogeneous activity. Use of a dimensional analysis, as presented above, allows a more accurate understanding of the many varieties of nonformal education which are possible. In fact, this diversity is a major source of the value of nonformal education. The combination of the dimensions and the variation which is possible within each dimension define the universe of possible programme designs. Of course, the dimensions are strongly interrelated and planning must pay careful attention to this interdependence. In any particular situation, there will be constraints placed on one or more dimensions by external factors. Beginning with these constraints, planners can then explore the diversity which remains by analysing design alternatives along the unconstrained dimensions.

The extent of the diversity of existing nonformal education

programmes is well reflected in the brief summary of programmes described in the following section.

What are the characteristics of nonformal education programmes today?

In order to provide planners with a wider perspective on nonformal education, this section briefly reviews some of the more prominent types of programmes in Africa, Asia and Latin America. The goals, organizations and programmes now being used are both rich and diverse, reflecting a great vitality in the nonformal education sector. The history of the development of nonformal education programmes on the different continents can, to some extent, be presented in terms of regional approaches. When looking at these types of programmes, the reader is encouraged to refer back to the discussion of dimensions above, and to note how different programmes emphasize one or more of those dimensions.

The historical development of nonformal education shows some commonalities within the geographic regions. In part, the commonalities reflect shared cultural, social and political forces. Tendencies to share experience within regions also account for some of the similarities. Yet the differences are historical and current movements in nonformal education reflect a world-wide sharing of experience and a diversification of efforts such that today there is as much commonality across regions as within them. Each region, for instance, has in common the fact that programmes which are now labelled nonformal education have been going on for many years under other labels. And there is increasing commonality in programme goals and methodologies across regions. In reading the following sections, the trend towards current commonalities should be kept in mind.

Nonformal education in Latin America. Latin America has perhaps the most distinctive history of developing certain types of nonformal education programmes. The formal education system in Latin America is quantitatively further advanced than in the other regions. There has been, as well, a relatively long history of development of non-school educational activities, often in the non-governmental sector. Two models of nonformal education are

notable in this context: the development of a network of national skill-training centres for modern industrial skills; and a widespread diffusion of radio schools for educational purposes.

The skill-training centres are exemplified by the early approaches in Brazil in an organization known as SENAI, and are now found in half a dozen or more countries in Andean Latin America. These programmes are characterized by residential skill-training courses of varying lengths, are financed by payroll or other taxes on industry, and are run by institutions which are completely separate from the formal school system. Neither credit nor other academic recognition is given, but certificates created by the training organization itself are common and have achieved considerable creditability with prospective employers. The pedagogical model used in many of these programmes is fairly formal and uses many aspects of the school model.

The radio school movement can trace its origins to Colombia where the long history of ACPO (Acción Cultural Popular) has served as a model and an active source of diffusion for a network of radio schools which now exists in well over thirty different countries in the region. The radio schools are typically church-based and are characterized by educational broadcasts to organized listening groups, created and monitored by a cadre of local leaders. The broadcasts offer sequential courses at different levels of accomplishment in basic literacy and numeracy, as well as topical programmes on a variety of developmental topics. Programmes are supplemented by printed learning materials, a journal or newspapers, and *campesino* libraries. In the larger organizations, there are networks of regional and national training centres for monitors of listening groups and supervisory personnel. Methodologies and experiences are shared at regular regional conferences.

Supplementing this institutionalized set of nonformal educational activities are recent programmes which arise from the acute sense of frustration and injustice generated by the disparities of economic and political power in Latin America society. The response among many field-workers has been a growing support for nonformal education as an approach to liberation. The roots of this movement are found among individuals associated with religious organizations, and came to be symbolized by the writings of Paulo Freire and his work in rural Brazil. His ideas found fertile soil and spread rapidly. In many locations, the resulting 'dialogi-

cal' approach—sometimes known as the psychosocial method— is linked to literacy and basic-education programmes for rural adults. These approaches share a common belief, derived from Freire, that education involves self-reflection and critical thought by the learners, that learning cannot occur unless it is accompanied by a testing of that knowledge in one's life-situation, and that in the process man is gradually transformed from an object of reality to a subject who directs and participates in his own development.

The ideas and the methodology developed by Freire and his followers have had a strong impact on nonformal education, particularly in Latin America, but increasingly in other parts of the world as well. In Latin America the ideas have permeated most types of non-school educational effort. Critics argue, with some justification, that in many cases the level of understanding and the degree of implementation do not go beyond the rhetoric. Nevertheless the degree of influence is impressive. It is not uncommon to find references to the approach in national education plans for adults, although the implementation may contain some fairly strong contradictions to the philosophy. As new programmes are developed, the impact of the liberation approach is likely to increase even further. The hope is that a genuine understanding of the philosophy and its implications will spread from the intellectual élite into the bureaucratic and technical staff which must implement most development programmes.

Nonformal education in Africa. Shifting focus to tropical Africa, one finds quite a different set of nonformal education programmes catering to a somewhat different set of needs. During the 1960s and 1970s, formal education systems in Africa underwent a period of rapid expansion. Within the last decade, the limits of expansion began to emerge first as the education component of national budgets reached and exceeded feasible limits, and second as the problem of unemployed school leavers emerged and grew to proportions which threatened political stability. Even so, the formal education system was serving only a relatively small sector of the overall population, and the demand for education was great and continues to grow. In this setting the interest in nonformal education arose from a sense of urgent need: feasible methods had to be found to provide access to some form of education for the large rural populations with little or no chance for formal schooling.

The result is a diversity of pragmatic, down-to-earth schemes which evolved independently in different countries. Most of the programmes began with a small group of individuals working in a limited setting, often sponsored by a religious group or a private foundation. In rural settings the emphasis has been on agricultural skills, literacy, local crafts or home-making topics. Several creative and unique models have emerged from the widespread problem of the unemployed primary school leaver. Both the Botswana Brigades and the Kenya Village Polytechnics were designed to provide productive ways of integrating primary school leavers into the process of rural development. Both models evolved from small projects at the local level; each grew by a process of trial and error, solving problems as they arose.

The Botswana Brigades combined productive work as a learning process and as a source of revenue. A small core of developmental courses supplemented the training and practical experience in building, farming, tanning and other rural crafts. The programme was designed not only to provide learners with useful practical skills, but also to help them bridge the difficult gap between learning and productive employment after learning. The Village Polytechnics in Kenya provide a parallel example, grounded in the Kenyan philosophy of self-help. Skill-training courses were run in trades known to be in demand in a particular area. Local finance and leadership was an essential component of the model, ensuring in theory that only enough places would be available to meet the local demand for that skill. Training would then shift to other skills. As a result there was no long-term commitment to teaching staff. Instructors were hired only for the duration of a particular course.

Although both the Kenyan and the Botswanan programmes were non-governmental, they gradually grew to the point where there was some support and co-ordination on the part of the government. Africa also contains a wide variety of vocational and skill-training programmes. Most of these programmes are very small, are typically found in a capital city or a large provincial town and often have trouble placing their graduates. Such efforts are usually supported by a ministry or a private organization, and are not part of a co-ordinated national effort to train skilled workers. Although co-ordination efforts are increasing, the relatively small size of the modern economy in many African coun-

tries limits the amount of skill training which is required. Projects which are designed to encourage and facilitate the self-employment of their graduates will continue to be needed in the nonformal education sector.

Another approach to nonformal education is found predominantly in francophone Africa under the general term of *animation rurale*. Originating in Morocco, the idea spread gradually south to Senegal and neighbouring countries. Linked with *animation rurale* are several other approaches such as the *maison familiale* and more recently in Senegal rural youth training centres under the name *enseignement moyen pratique*. All of these share a developmental philosophy which stresses local initiative, limited infusion of outside resources and the use of an *animateur* who serves as a catalyst for problem definition, development of improvement schemes and encouraging local leadership in carrying them out. The more recent versions stress the lessening of economic dependence of the villages on the modern goods of urban life, and the 'recentring' of the rural economy on production and consumption of their own goods.

Finally, the relatively small usage made of radio for nonformal education in Africa is worth a comment. Radio in Africa is a centralized, state-owned and run operation with only a small number of stations in each country. In contrast, Latin American countries may have dozens or in some cases hundreds of small, locally owned and operated stations. The implications for nonformal educational programmes are clear. Hence, in Africa, educational radio is of necessity a government activity and tends to be on a national scale. Well-known examples include the series of national radio campaigns in Tanzania, the adult-education component of the national television programme in the Ivory Coast, and a small pilot effort with radio in Niger. Non-formal education activities usually build on existing structures, and consequently are limited by them as well. The African models reflect this fact.

Nonformal education in Africa is generally at an early stage of institutionalization and is characterized by a rich diversity of models and approaches, along with predictable overlap and confusion as to who is responsible for what. Nevertheless, the nonformal education practitioner will find ideas and models in Africa that merit careful study and analysis. Those that function successfully

under extreme limitations of resources may offer important ideas to educators in other settings.

Nonformal education in Asia. Turning to Asia, one finds that nonformal education has developed in ways which are intermediate between the other two continents. Formal education is well developed throughout the region, but faces strong demands from large and growing school-age populations. Non-school education has a long history, particularly in the fields of literacy, community development and population education. In some settings cultural traditions persist, with their own educational processes still functioning in religious centres of one kind or another. Historical traditions of reverence for education are common and many of these traditions form at least an attitudinal base for current non-school educational efforts. Educational needs are defined by considerable poverty and strong population pressure on resources in much of the region.

Not surprisingly, nonformal education projects in the region tend to focus around two themes: agricultural and related community development, and population education. The pressing need to contain the growth of population while continuing to feed the large existing population has led to a great variety of both government-sponsored national programmes and privately sponsored local ones. There is a long history of community development efforts, some of which have provided models for the rest of the world. The Comilla project in Bangladesh is well known for its integrated approach to local development, which combines land reform, agricultural extension, education and health practices. Working from a district-level headquarters where each of the appropriate government ministries is represented, the project uses village leaders as the linkage to activities in the village level, combining education and action in a productive manner. In India, a well-developed local, district and national structure also exists for the whole range of community development activities.

Population education is widespread in Asia, using techniques ranging from adaptations of traditional puppet shows in Indonesia to extensive national media campaigns in several countries. Although initially in the hands of private organizations, population education now receives strong government backing in most countries in Asia. Some of the most innovative nonformal educa-

tion models operating on a large scale exist in Asia and might serve as models for other regions.

Asia is unique in the extent to which nonformal education has progressed from small local activities to nationally co-ordinated and supported programmes. Community development, population education and adult-education efforts in most Asian countries are carried out under national direction by well-developed administrative structures. Problems normally associated with large-scale administrations also exist, and can provide planners with case studies of both the costs and the benefits of nationally managed efforts in nonformal education. The adult and community education programmes now being strengthened in both Thailand and Indonesia offer instructive examples which would reward study by planners.

Cross-national co-ordination is now being provided for nonformal education in Asia under the direction of SEAMEO which has sponsored a series of national studies on nonformal education and has convened region-wide conferences on the topic. SEAMEO continues to encourage conscious efforts at systematic evaluation of existing models, and to facilitate the sharing of the results. At the national ministry level, there is considerable knowledge about nonformal education in Asia. The situation in Asia may represent some of the future directions of development of nonformal education in the other regions, particularly in terms of likely results of increased planning and co-ordination.

Nonformal education in revolutionary societies. Finally, some comments are necessary on a group of countries which does not fit into any geographic region. A small number of societies have attempted, with varying degrees of success, to make major transformations of their political, social and economic structures. Cuba, Tanzania and China are three such countries whose efforts in the field of education have received considerable attention. In all three countries, attempts have been made to reorient radically the structure and the goals of the educational system—both the formal and the nonformal aspects—to support the creation and the maintenance of the new social structures. The changes in the educational systems are the result of the changes in the larger society, and are possible because of those changes.

Significantly perhaps, none of these countries has any policy for

or discusses nonformal education as a separate area of education. Instead, the concept of education has changed. The schools are opened, both physically and conceptually; the clientèle for education is broadened to include everyone of all ages; the methodologies become those of mobilization and participation; and the content of education is expanded to include the values and behaviours that are required of all citizens at work, in the home and in school. During the early stages of revolution schools are often closed for extended periods of time; students are sent out into the country to learn new values, to work and to help bring literacy to those not in school. Education in its broadest sense becomes a means for mobilizing widespread participation in reorienting personal values and promoting the general development of skills in the entire population.

The Cuban literacy campaign provides a clear example. Teachers and students alike were sent to the countryside to teach literacy and to work and learn alongside the people. The goals of the campaign were as much to re-educate the students and the teachers, who were largely urban in background, to the realities and the values of a rural agricultural setting as they were to teach literacy. Policies in China have for many years included the large-scale transfer of teenagers to rural communes for long periods of work and education in the values of the revolution. Even in the more moderate setting of Tanzania, students could not aspire to higher education without several years of national service and a history of co-operative effort in their earlier school careers.

Running through these examples are two themes. First, in all cases work and education are to be viewed as equally desirable and necessary parts of life for everyone. Schooling should not make a person superior to others with less schooling and work is just as socially valuable as study. All education is to be effectively integrated with work and production, as in the case of the Cuban school in the countryside where half the day is spent in productive work and half in study, and the Chinese approach of setting up schools in factories. Learning and work are paired together and everyone, young and old, has the opportunity and the obligation to participate in both.

Second, formal, nonformal and even informal education are viewed as a unified sector serving the goals and the needs of the state. Associated with this is the additional belief that the entire

range of educational activities is a proper concern for the national government, by which such activities are actively planned, monitored and financially supported. Whether such a comprehensive and government-managed model is appropriate for non-revolutionary societies is a question for planners and citizens alike. Even if the approach is not appropriate, there is much to be learned from the ways in which the whole educational sector is mobilized in revolutionary societies.

This quick review of nonformal education efforts provides a look at the richness and the diversity present in the field today. The survey also suggests the historical roots and the regional settings from which many of the most popular models of nonformal education were derived. Each type of programme highlights different dimensions from the list discussed in the previous section and should help readers envision new approaches for their own settings. The discussion of revolutionary societies sets the stage for exploring the issues of nonformal education and development raised in the next section.

What is the role of nonformal education in development and social change?

Before undertaking a discussion of planning for nonformal education, careful thought must be given to the possible role which nonformal education can and should play in the process of national development. At the national policy level, discussion on nonformal education will necessarily be a part of the larger discussion of the role of all kinds of education in development. Some general guidelines about the size, the range of purposes and the division of resources between various approaches to education must be formulated before any meaningful planning can take place. The decisions leading to the creation of such guidelines are primarily political in nature and are made by political leaders. Planners, however, must have a reasonable understanding of the alternatives and be clear on the limits of education of all kinds as a force for development. This section is intended to help planners understand these larger issues which influence the options that the political process will make available to the planners.

Goals of national development. At the heart of any planning process lie two questions. First, the question of goals. For nations, this question is: 'What kind of a society do we want to build?' To answer the question, planners and leaders must have a vision of the kind of political, social and economic structure which they wish to create. For the second question—that of means—they must assess the current structure in their country and then develop a change strategey which will lead from the current situation to the desired future structure. Both these larger questions must be dealt with before any significant planning can take place in the educational sector.

In very general terms, the goals of development can be viewed as ranging along a continuum. At one end there is the goal of modernization, a term which is often taken to mean movement towards societies such as those in the United States and western Europe. Most developing countries already have a modern sector which is linked economically to the western economies of the world. For those nations choosing modernization as the goal, the dominant development strategy is one of gradual change and reform. The basic structure is seen as suitable already, but numerous faults and inefficiencies must be corrected. Change is seen as taking place within the context of the existing structure, and as involving modifications to aspects of that structure. The role of education in such a context is to provide adequate numbers of trained persons to satisfy the needs of the growing modern sector. The major role of the schools is to carry out a publicly acceptable process of selecting and training appropriate numbers of students to be allocated to different roles in society. Educational services, both formal and nonformal, will be gradually extended to serve those not currently reached, but the rate of growth will be limited by the resources available and the absorptive capacity of the modern sector.

At the other end of the spectrum are nations whose goal is a society with a very different economic and social structure. Significant changes are sought, in comparison to the western model, in terms of the ownership of production, the process of allocating economic surpluses and the distribution of resources to all parts of the society. Since this goal represents a major change from the structure currently existing in most countries, these kinds of developmental goals are often associated with change strategies

which stress the need for confrontation, conflict and radical reform of the existing system. Existing educational institutions, both formal and nonformal, are seen as primarily functioning to train people to fit into the existing system and therefore of little help in promoting the kinds of attitudes and activities necessary to bring about change.

However, there are some proponents of nonformal education who would argue that certain types of nonformal education can function to promote an increased awareness among people of the need for substantial social change. From this perspective, nonformal education which includes a strong component of consciousness-raising, and which gradually develops in learners a sense of responsibility and a sense of the need to press for changes, can be an important part of the reform process. These same proponents would argue that the close ties of the formal school system to the current structure make schools an unlikely ally in the fight for change. Even the consciousness-raising types of nonformal education will be constrained by the tolerance of the current structure for dissent and debate. Certainly educational activities alone have no chance of forcing substantial structural change.

In terms of their development goals, most countries lie somewhere between the western modernization goal and the radical social change goal. Development goals are a mixture and the strategies being followed are likewise a mixture. Often contradictory strategies will be followed at the same time, reflecting the ambivalence about goals or the changing patterns of goals over time. Appropriate educational policies will also be a mixture, coupled with a tendency for educational plans to lag behind the articulation of goals for the larger society. Typically, nonformal education projects which support modernization will coexist with other projects which place greater emphasis on liberation. Planners will ultimately want to encourage nonformal education programmes which support the thrust of national development goals.

The dialogue between formal and nonformal education. How should the roles of formal education and nonformal education be defined to promote development? What functions are best carried out by formal education, and what tasks should be performed by the nonformal education system? These questions reflect the

rational, technical approach to planning. In reality, of course, technical criteria are normally secondary to political and social criteria in the arena of basic educational policy. Nevertheless, planners ought to have a basic understanding of the options which are technically possible, if only to be able to articulate the costs incurred in choosing different options.

What is the situation in the majority of developing countries? Most of these countries have chosen to follow the developmental goal of modernization, although there are many variations in the detailed goals. In terms of education, the general scenario in most of these countries shares the following characteristics. The current education system, after a period of rapid expansion during the past two decades, now absorbs a very substantial part of the national budget—often as much as 25 per cent or, in a few cases, even more. The prospects for increasing the proportion of national resources going to education are slim, and in fact some countries will be moving to reduce the proportion. Nearly all of these resources are being absorbed by the formal school system, with only small amounts being allocated to nonformal education.

The rapid increase in the size of the formal system has increased attendance rates substantially, but continued population growth and resource limitations have meant that large parts of the school-age population are still not attending school. The goal of universal primary education, widely supported in the 1960s, is now being quietly dropped from the goals of most countries for this century at least. Serious thought is being given to limiting the growth of formal school capacity to a size which will leave a goodly portion of the school-age population without a chance to attend school.

Given this scenario for the countries which have chosen modernization, what are the possible roles for nonformal education? Three alternatives can be suggested which help to highlight the basic issues involved. In each case the dialogue between formal and nonformal education is paralleled by a dialogue between technical rationales and socio-political concerns.

The first alternative is called the *basic education* approach. Those favouring this alternative argue that since there is no hope of providing full primary-school education for all children, some other alternative must be found for those who cannot attend school. The alternative, delivered by some form of nonformal

education, should be designed to provide the basic learning essential to anyone who is a citizen in the country. Included are such things as: basic literacy and numeracy, simple vocational skills, basic health information, and the attitudes and values necessary for effective citizenship. Since nonformal education would be cheaper and of shorter duration, countries could afford to give every child at least the minimal amount of basic education, while maintaining an ongoing formal education system for those who could gain admission.

From a resource allocation point of view, such a solution can be defended. It is better to give at least minimal education to everyone than to provide formal schooling for perhaps 60 per cent of the school-age group. Yet, politically and socially, such a policy is hard to defend, and in most countries would not be acceptable. Such a dual system condemns those who do not attend school to remain in the poor, traditional sector of the economy. Because of the uneven distribution of schooling opportunities, such an approach usually results in certain geographic areas and ethnic groups within a country being placed permanently in a second-class situation. Although some amelioration of this problem is possible by installing transfer mechanisms between the basic-education sector and the formal schools, such mechanisms are difficult to put in place and have low credibility even when they are working.

The second alternative might be described as the *merger of formal and nonformal* educational into a unified system. This approach is characterized by a systematic functional analysis of learning goals. Each learning task is analysed and then the learning environment which is best able to meet that need for a particular population is chosen as the delivery mechanism. Formal education is broadened to include many nonformal techniques. Nonformal educational activities are elevated to equal status with the formal approaches, and they work side by side to meet the complete range of learning needs of children and adults. This approach acknowledges that many of the tasks currently assigned to formal schools could be better achieved through non-school educational processes.

Politically and socially, however, such an approach encounters difficulty. In order to set up a merged system, substantial reallocation of resources from schools to non-school education would be

necessary because of the overall ceiling on educational expenditures facing most countries. Such reallocation is a highly volatile issue because it attacks one of the basic functions of formal schooling—that of selection for entrance into the modern sector of the economy and society. Schools are endowed by society with a 'charter' which gives them the power to select, train and then certify those individuals who will be admitted into the modern wage economy. Those who drop out or who attain lower levels of certification are so labelled, and move into other parts of society. Merging the schools into a much broader system threatens this key function of formal education and by extension the structure of the society which supports the schools. As a result the merger approach, while very rational, is unlikely to be feasible in a non-revolutionary society.

The third alternative can be labelled *non-competitive nonformal education*. This alternative puts consideration of social and political reality in modernizing countries foremost and tries to work within these limits. Any sizeable gain in nonformal education activities would tend to take resources away from the formal system, and would therefore be likely to meet strong opposition. Nonformal education should therefore concentrate primarily on serving adults and older children who have no further hope of attending school. In this way, nonformal education will not be perceived as a second-class system without access to the chartering functions of the schools. To the extent that nonformal education focuses on agricultural, vocational, health and similar skill areas, resources may be found outside the education budget. Small additional resources may also be found from private sources, and in some countries from the education budget as well.

This alternative may seem modest, but may well represent current reality in countries where more widespread structural reforms are not contemplated. The non-competitive strategy helps to shift emphasis away from education as an isolated activity, and towards education as one component of a more integrated strategy for development. Instead of organizing separate education activities, education becomes a part of larger efforts for agricultural and community development. Under such circumstances nonformal education may be the more productive. Skills learned in the absence of the other inputs necessary to use those skills become unused skills which rapidly are forgotten. For many societies, the

prospect of integrating nonformal education into other development processes may be both practical and possible.

The three alternatives sketched out in this section refer to options in countries which have chosen a predominantly modernization approach to development. In the case of the few countries which have undertaken fundamental reforms of their whole society, the options for nonformal educational approaches are much greater. The discussion of nonformal education in revolutionary societies in the earlier part of this chapter provides a good description of what is possible. The crucial aspect of reform is unlinking the formal education system from entrance to the better jobs in society. Once the incentive system is altered, the options for expansion of nonformal education are greatly increased. Suffice it to say here that, of the three options just presented, merger is the one most likely to be useful once a society has undertaken fundamental reform of political and social structures.

This brief outline of alternative directions for the dialogue between formal and nonformal education oversimplifies a very complex set of issues. However, it is intended to highlight the major variables which affect the relationships between any kind of education and development. Planners will repeatedly be forced to consider the key issues of social charter, of equity of access and of severely limited resources when seeking to plan nonformal education. These same issues lie at the heart of most of the criticisms which have been made of further expansion of nonformal education.

The critics of nonformal education. Two basic criticisms have been levelled at nonformal education. The first focuses directly on the lack of a social 'charter' for nonformal education. Nonformal education activities are not usually credentialling processes and their graduates therefore cannot compete effectively with graduates of formal education for jobs. Only formal schools are chartered to perform this role. An important aspect of the 'charter' granted to schools is its relative independence of the actual knowledge of the graduates. The fact that they have graduated from a given institution is in itself sufficient evidence for society to accept them at a certain level. Nonformal education activities may in fact produce real gains in the ability of their participants, but

lacking any sort of societal 'charter' these graduates will have weak claims on further education or on employment.

As a result, participants quickly recognize the low efficacy of such training and turn to it only when formal schooling is unavailable or when as individuals they are unable to gain admittance. Their motivation will not be the presumed greater relevance of the training offered or its more immediate applicability in their lives, but the reluctant acceptance of a second-best alternative. In the more structured forms of nonformal education, the goal of many participants may be primarily one of improving their chances to enter or re-enter the formal system. For those who have no hope of entering the formal system, the nonformal alternatives offer a chance, but clearly a second-class chance when judged by the probability of giving participants access to the modern sector. The pervasiveness of the 'instrumental' approach to education is so extensive as to undermine many attempts to design educational programmes and offer it on a 'functional' basis. For parents and pupils alike, school is an instrument for access into a salaried job and not primarily a place to gain functional knowledge to apply in one's current life situation. Many critics fear that the effect of nonformal education in this context will be merely to develop a second-class system of education which is patronized solely by the disadvantaged sectors of society, who in turn will remain relatively disadvantaged because of the lack of 'charter' of nonformal education. In short, nonformal education will serve to reinforce existing social inequities rather than to reduce them.

The second point arises out of the first. There is evidence to suggest that those who enter nonformal educational programmes emerge with relatively lower expectations than those who go to schools. They are thus more disposed to take low-paying jobs or to work outside the modern sector. From the planning point of view this may be viewed as a desirable positive outcome since the number of openings in the modern sector is already small and is increasing slowly. From the critics' point of view, this amounts to a process of 'cooling out' legitimate demands of the less fortunate parts of society for equal access to the modern sector. Lowered expectations result in less political pressure for change, and therefore less likelihood that the major structural changes which are viewed as necessary for more equitable distribution of resources

will take place. In this perspective, nonformal education becomes a servant of the state, controlled by a small élite group which reaps most of the benefits of the current structure. The argument thus returns to the issue raised earlier as to the goal of development and the change strategy felt to be most likely to achieve the goal.

Nonformal education and social change. Although nonformal education is certainly not a major source of pressure for social change, programme design does influence the degree of support which a particular programme will provide for goals of either modernization or liberation. An analysis of the variety of existing nonformal education programmes reveals an important dimension of choice in terms of the strategy for change which underlies a programme.

This choice can be characterized in simple terms as lying along a continuum which stretches between two approaches: *person-centred* or psychological approaches which assume that change concentrates on changing personal characteristics of the individuals involved; and the *system-centred* or sociological approaches which assume that change begins with the economic and political structure of the society within which the individuals must operate. Discussions of the characteristics and implications of these two perspectives are now occurring in the context of nonformal education.

The *person-centred* approach has been predominant in nonformal education for several reasons. Perhaps the most important reason is the feasibility and the practicality of working with individuals within the context of existing governmental and social structures. Such an approach assumes that if individuals can be changed by modernizing their attitudes, and by giving them skills and knowledge, then they will be able actively to promote development in their own lives and, as groups, in the life of their community. The individual approach is derived from two different development thrusts: the assumptions that lack of opportunity has produced a deficit in individual capabilities, and that a long history of psychological dependence has made the individual incapable of freeing himself from the structure which is the cause of his poverty. The deficit philosophy leads to the design of programmes with goals of providing skills and knowledge which

will overcome the deficit. The dependency philosophy leads to programmes intended to produce a new type of person who is critically aware of the forces acting on his life, and who can gradually free himself from the psychological dependence which supports the continued existence of the current structure. In either case the primary emphasis is on the individual and the goal is a change in one or more aspects of the individual.

The weaknesses in the person-centred approach centre around a single issue. The participants in such programmes are generally left with the difficult task of applying their new knowledge and behaviours in a setting whose economic and political structure has in no way changed as a result of their training. Both in-school and nonformal education programmes generally accept as a sufficient goal the development of new information, attitudes and skills in the participants. Little or no evaluation takes place in terms of the applications of these new characteristics outside the educational setting. Success is defined in terms of the production of specified characteristics in the participants. From a more general point of view the person-centred approach reinforces the strong tendency to attribute the causes of underdevelopment to persons rather than to institutions. Consequently, educational planners have tended to focus the educational 'treatment' solely on persons and to exclude social systems and institutional structures.

In contrast, the *system-centred* approach is based on the premise that significant change can only come about from changes in the basic structures of society. This more holistic approach emphasizes the linkage between individuals, institutions and the environment and seeks to promote improvement in individual lives by modifying the patterns of relationship in the society. Once significant changes in the structure open up new opportunities and demand new skills of individuals, then more traditional educational approaches can quickly fill the needs thus created. Experience in various programmes in work-related skills training and in literacy supports the belief that individuals can quickly acquire literacy and other skills when they see real opportunities to use them. The system-centred approach also tends to promote a more thoughtful analysis of the actual role played by various forms of education in terms of selection for upward mobility and relationships between training efforts and subsequent employment. Nonformal education efforts in this perspective are clearly revealed as only one of

several essential ingredients in the process of development. In particular, this viewpoint helps to combat the belief that education can and should be the prime mover in the development of poor and rural areas.

The limitations of the system-centred approach lie with questions of practicality and feasibility. Historically, nonformal education projects have often been sponsored by relatively small organizations like churches, private volunteer organizations, local associations, or by a section within a specific ministry. Even ministries, however, are unlikely to have enough influence or power to begin a serious attempt at restructuring the social or economic system of even a small region. And to the extent that such changes would necessarily require a redistribution of power and resources they would generate strong opposition from those who now benefit from the existing system, and who most likely are in positions of authority within the ministries. If the reader will look back over the range of programmes reviewed in the previous section, except for those in revolutionary societies virtually all of them can be categorized as primarily person-centred. Given the kinds of support necessary for more system-change oriented educational efforts, this preponderance should not be surprising. There are a few notable exceptions where integrated rural development schemes promoted either by an autonomous local authority or by a co-ordinated effort between various ministries have included nonformal educational projects.

This section has articulated the boundaries within which any planning of nonformal education must take place. The overall social and political structure of a country combined with its development goals set the basic framework within which both formal and nonformal education function. The options open to nonformal education depend strongly on this framework, which also causes the weaknesses that undermine efforts to create a type of nonformal education which will contribute effectively to development. Finally, strategies within nonformal education programmes vary in ways which have different likely consequences for development.

III. Approaches to planning nonformal education

This chapter looks at the current state of the art of planning for nonformal education. The chapter begins with some of the general issues which surround planning for nonformal education, including some cautions about the degree to which planning is appropriate for such activities. The next sections contain an extensive discussion of the basic steps in planning nonformal education and ways in which these procedures might be applied. The chapter concludes with a brief set of comments on the topic of costs in nonformal education.

Unlike other aspects of educational planning, the area of nonformal education is very much in a state of development. The presentation in this chapter reflects current thinking on the topic, but is by no means a handbook which will provide detailed instructions on how to go about planning for nonformal education. The chapter provides a series of general guidelines which planners can use as they begin the necessary trial-and-error process in their own settings. These guidelines should help the planner avoid the more serious errors and focus attention on the issues which have yet to be resolved in a clear way.

Should nonformal education be planned?

The debate about whether nonformal education can or should be planned reflects the contrasts in its historical roots which were discussed at the beginning of Chapter II. Two of the roots, the practitioners and the critics of schooling, flourished outside government-initiated activities, while the third root, the educational

planners, emerged from centralized national government planning efforts. From the contrast in these roots there arise a number of issues. Should nonformal education be planned and organized as a national system which parallels the formal school system? Should it be co-ordinated at a national level with decentralized planning and administration at lower levels or should nonformal education be left largely in the hands of individual practitioners and their private sponsoring agencies? Emerging from these basic questions are others which focus on issues such as the locus of control for individual programmes, the flexibility to respond in a timely manner to educational needs, and the basic question as to whether nonformal education should be largely a government activity or primarily one run by private organizations and groups of individuals. Running through all these issues is the concern that government planning will mean a loss of the vitality and initiative which characterizes the best programmes in nonformal education.

To many observers the characteristics of nonformal education which explain its success are precisely those which are felt to be incompatible with large bureaucracies. The most effective nonformal education programmes exist and survive because of their flexibility. They are tailored to the specific characteristics of the local situation, they often begin as the result of local initiative and the decision-making process is generally close to the level of implementation. Changes are made quickly to meet new needs, goals are flexible, and there is a sense of programme ownership on the part of the users. Programmes can benefit from a process of trial and error, dropping unsuccessful aspects and expanding those which are effective. These kinds of characteristics are very difficult to build into larger-scale government planning bodies. Of necessity, governments require long time horizons for planning, seeking authorization, obtaining funds, selecting staff and implementing programmes. Decisions must be reviewed at many levels, with corresponding delays and compromises.

Can these two conflicting sets of needs be accommodated in a planning process for nonformal education? A number of countries have established national programmes of nonformal education, usually housed within a section of the ministry of education. The advantages of a centrally managed programme include more visibility for nonformal education, a greater claim on central government resources, the opportunity to use systems methods of plan-

ning and evaluation, and the possibility of better co-ordination and reduced duplication of effort. The disadvantages are familiar. Even with a philosophy of decentralization, there is a strong tendency for planning and decision-making to be carried on centrally and then disseminated to local users. There is also strong pressure for non-governmental programmes to be gradually brought under the control of the ministry, with a resultant decrease in local participation and initiative.

At the other extreme, lies the policy of no central planning. This is essentially the situation in many countries, including some with a variety of flourishing local efforts in nonformal education. The advantages of this approach have been outlined above. The disadvantages fall in the area of duplication, of overlapping programmes, of competition for scarce resources, and in problems of uneven quality and effectiveness. What planning there is takes place within programmes and ranges in sophistication from completely *ad hoc* responses to problems to reasonably good procedures undertaken by the more experienced private volunteer organizations which support specific nonformal education activities.

The compromise position is a mixture of systems planning and programme planning. No effort is made to provide detailed planning at the national level. Rather the national level focuses on setting general policies, articulating national priorities and identifying the worst cases of duplication. At the subnational level, effort is focused on co-ordination of two kinds: first, co-ordination between the nonformal education activities of the various government ministries—particularly agriculture, health, education, and rural development; and second, the setting up of informal councils which facilitate information exchange, mutual support and planning among the wide variety of non-governmental bodies involved in nonformal education. Programme planning is left to those actually responsible for implementing specific activities, but with support and encouragement from the co-ordinating bodies. This approach will be articulated further in the latter part of the chapter.

The core issue underlying the choice of organizational structure for planning is that of *locus of control*. Programmes which must respond to local needs in a timely fashion require a great deal of local autonomy. To generate local enthusiasm, to raise resources

locally and to create a sense among participants that they are influencing their own situations is a nearly impossible task if the locus of control lies much above the sub-district level. The locus of control is an important factor when programme goals include the development of self-reliance, local initiative and increased social consciousness. These skills can be learned only through practice, and usually only after a long series of experiences. For opportunities to exist for such learning there must be some real power at the lowest levels. The challenge to planners is to assess the amount of local control which is initially feasible and then to devise a gradual process whereby greater freedom is slowly allowed to evolve as the competence and the confidence of the participants grow. In situations where the locus of control is primarily at the national or regional level, programme goals of self-reliance and participative decision-making are largely unachievable.

A major motivation for encouraging nonformal education is the belief that it can mobilize added resources from the local community and the users. Governments see this possibility as a way to extend education beyond what would be possible with government resources alone. Experience indicates that resources such as buildings, personnel and some recurrent expenses can, within limits, be generated on the local level. However, the extent and, more important, the duration of such efforts is directly related to the degree to which those resources stay in the community and remain under local control. When 'voluntary' contributions are siphoned off to the district or regional level for allocation, the process is quickly recognized by participants as a form of taxation, which rapidly discourages further local initiative or participation. For effective mobilization of local resources, control must remain largely at the local level.

Minorities and smaller ethnic groups within the larger society can also benefit substantially from nonformal education at a local level. Programmes are created by such groups to preserve ethnic values, provide support to community members and promote their ability to negotiate with the larger, dominant social system. Initially, all groups in a society attempt to use formal education as the primary means for mobility. However, if that system is felt to have been captured by the dominant groups, then a smaller group may turn to a more locally controlled nonformal education alter-

native. Such programmes serve two purposes: to teach the skills needed to compete in the larger system; and to provide a positive viewpoint of the particular cultural group sponsoring the education. The latter is especially important when the dominant society holds prejudices against the group and the larger school system tends to reinforce these prejudices. Efforts of this kind often become a stimulus for the development of a group and the region in which they live.

In the perspective of national planners, such a nonformal education system may be viewed as a mixed blessing. In new states, the tolerance for activities which emphasize local rather than national perspectives may be limited. None the less, it may be recognized that local initiative can succeed in launching educational efforts of considerable value. Politicians and planners have to make a judgement as to whether such activities are sufficiently worth while to tolerate some differences in perspective in return for the added educational capacity and the self-improvement process generated. In the long run such activities are often incorporated into the overall system when the special needs have been met.

Finally, the basic issue must be faced as to whether nonformal education is primarily a public enterprise supported by tax revenues, primarily a private activity of volunteer and religious organizations, or a mixture of both. If a mixture, then what are the proportions and who is to control the overall sector? Historically, almost all nonformal education was in the private sector. Today, with the increased legitimacy and visibility has come increased investment by international assistance agencies working through the national governments. In many countries, too, an increasing national commitment of personnel and resources is also evident. In those countries concern begins to surface about control, about duplication of efforts, and hence the need for planning of the nonformal education sector.

Yet the need for planning and accountability of public funds which exists in government operations should not be blindly taken as a desirable approach for the non-governmental activities. Once a planning process for nonformal education begins in the government sector there will be a strong momentum towards gradually expanding the planning process to include all nonformal education activities. If carried out at a centralized, national level

the results could be very detrimental to precisely those characteristics of nonformal education which make it effective. To preserve the strengths of nonformal education, a way must be found to preserve the freedom and local autonomy which make those strengths possible. That is the central issue to be faced in any approach to planning non-formal education.

Criteria for the design of planning procedures

To devise planning strategies for nonformal education, criteria are needed that will assist in the choice between alternative approaches. As the discussion in Chapter II of dimensions for analysing nonformal education projects showed, nonformal education is not a single, easily categorized activity. Rather, it is an immensely diverse collection of educational enterprises of widely divergent goals, methods and outcome. Thus, it would seem highly unlikely that there should be a single planning process which encompasses all these activities. We are used to thinking of educational planning for schools as a holistic endeavour. Generalizing from that experience is a natural tendency, but is, in fact, most inappropriate. While schooling is largely homogeneous in nature, nonformal education is not.

The implications of this diversity should be clear; there is no single planning strategy, but rather there is a *differentiated set* of planning procedures with different methods for different categories of programmes. These approaches differ not only in the planning methods used but, what is more important, they differ in the extent to which *any planning at all* is desirable. This relatively simple principle is probably the key to sorting out the formidable task of dealing with the diversity of activities included within nonformal education.

An important distinction needs to be clarified at the beginning. Differentiated planning processes mean something quite different from decentralized processes. Decentralization starts from the basic premise that an activity is a unified sector and that overall control and management is both desirable and possible. Decentralization implies that selected responsibilities and tasks are delegated to lower levels within the system, but that all levels will continue to use the same basic approach, co-ordinated and specified by the centre. Differentiated, on the other hand, suggests that

quite different planning approaches may be used for different educational activities. There is no assumption of centralized co-ordination of a unified sector. On the contrary, some nonformal education should not be planned at all, some should be planned at the programme level, and certain kinds may be appropriately planned by the central government.

What criteria can be used to help the planner select the amount of planning and the type of planning which are appropriate for a particular kind of nonformal education? Important criteria would include the following:

The geographical spread of the clintèle who are likely to participate.

The ratio of government to non-government resources which will be required.

The amount of scarce technical expertise and expensive equipment which will be needed.

The estimated duration of the need for the programme.

As a general rule, the greater the extent to which one or more of these criteria apply to an activity, the more appropriate some form of government planning will be. Conversely, the less the extent to which any of these criteria apply, the less likely it is that any sort of structured planning should be undertaken for those types of nonformal education. The reader should keep in mind that this discussion is focused on system planning for a range of activities, and does not apply to programme planning within a specific project.

Programmes which are national or regional in conception will require careful planning and organization of larger numbers of people and resources. Mounting a national literacy campaign or a large-scale radio and discussion-group learning system are activities which will clearly require some form of system-wide planning and co-ordination. In contrast, a programme to provide local women with family planning and nutrition education within a subdistrict would not need planning activity by anyone other than those directly involved in sponsoring the activity. District or regional officials might wish to know that such an activity was being considered, but should confine their role to facilitating the efforts of the sponsoring organization and providing them with information about other activities in the same area with which co-ordination would be constructive. Programmes which are ini-

tially small, but which spread to wider populations over the years, would gradually become appropriate for attention in regional planning efforts. The amount of planning should be determined primarily by its usefulness in facilitating access to resources in improving co-ordination and successful accomplishment of programme goals.

An even clearer criterion is provided by the sources of funding for an activity. Programmes which are wholly financed by private organizations or local resources should generally remain outside any system planning efforts on a detailed basis. Programmes which receive direct subsidies from tax revenues, particularly from regional or national sources, would be more appropriately involved in regional-level planning while programmes that are largely or completely financed by government resources would have to be included in whatever planning mechanisms existed for nonformal education. Using this criterion would provide substantial protection for the freedom of many programmes which would function better without any direct planning or control relationship to the government. To the extent that a programme grows to make demands on public resources, then some planning and oversight of its activities is appropriate.

Similarly, to the extent that an educational activity will require scarce technical skills and expensive equipment, then greater direct planning involvement is necessary. The guiding principle is the relative scarcity of the inputs. The scarcer the inputs, the higher their value and the greater the cost to society if they are not used in an efficient and equitable manner. Proposals to build and staff vocational training centres for industrial and agricultural skills should be considered with care. The history of such training facilities is one of mixed success at best, particularly when the cost of trained participants who do not go on to utilize their new skills in productive activities is considered. Large expensive buildings and costly training equipment which must be imported are often poor investments. The equipment tends to become obsolete quickly and the training is often of little use to potential employers. In addition, there are basic questions as to whether the state should be financing such activities when most of the benefits accrue to the employers rather than to the trainees. Although this is not the place to discuss strategies of vocational skill training, its relative costliness and history of mixed success provide a good

example of a type of programme which needs careful central planning.

The expected duration of the need for a training activity provides another criterion. Needs which can easily be met by several short cycles of activity would not be appropriate for planning. Needs which are expected to continue for some time would be more appropriate. There are sometimes problems with programmes which begin on a small scale, but prove to be unexpectedly popular and spread rapidly. Such programmes may well reach a point where their spread and their implications would justify planning attention.

The Village Polytechnics of Kenya provide an instructive example of this problem. Initially, the polytechnics were small village-based craft and skill-training centres. They operated under the general sponsorship of a central church organization but with local governing boards. They drew primarily on local resources and used whatever craftsmen or part-time staff were resident in the area. The content of the training and the numbers trained in a particular skill were closely tied to the absorptive capacity of the local region. Courses were to be run only as long as local demand existed. Training would then shift to new skills, or the activities of the polytechnic would be allowed to lapse for a period of time. With the initial successes though, pressures grew to formalize the offerings. Parents and participants pressed for certificates and examinations which would facilitate the entrance of those finishing courses into the modern wage sector. Finding such jobs often meant moving to an urban setting, an action which contradicted the basic goal of the polytechnics, which was to prepare youth for productive lives in the local setting. Nevertheless, political pressures were strong. Demands to improve the quality of training and associated demands for financial assistance continued to grow. The ministry finally responded by building a supervisory and administrative structure to answer the demands.

In short, a small-scale, localized training effort mushroomed into a national institutionalized training model which has every chance of becoming a permanent feature of the educational landscape. Had such a scale been envisioned originally, serious questions about the advisability of the undertaking might have arisen. To cope with such situations, ministries need an information-gathering procedure which will provide some warning when

events seem to be moving in a way that has planning implications. The danger of short-term programmes becoming institutionalized, even when they have outlived their original goals, is a substantial one. It may be impossible to prevent institutionalization, but early awareness may allow planners to mitigate the worst effects of such movements.

The risks of not planning are part of another criterion worthy of a few comments. Planning, like any other activity, has both costs and benefits. The decision to undertake a particular kind of planning should always be weighed in terms of the balance between the costs and the benefits. The costs include not only the direct costs of carrying out the planning but the risks, such as unplanned growth. But equally important are the indirect effects on local initiative and the opportunity to develop planning skills among the practitioners of nonformal education. Planning almost always involves some shift in the locus of control away from the practitioners and towards planners and policy-makers. Balancing the benefits of increased planning against the costs in training opportunities will always be a matter of judgement, but it should be one of the explicit criteria used in designing planning for nonformal education.

The discussion of these criteria provides a good beginning for making decisions about what kinds of nonformal education activities should be included in a planning process. The reader will no doubt be able to think of some other criteria as well—for instance, the need to serve certain minority groups that are unable to make use of the existing educational services. Helping such groups gain more equitable treatment will often require the direct intervention of a higher government authority and would become part of a planning process. The discussion also provides some clues as to the types of planning which would be most appropriate depending on the characteristics of the activity. In the next section, the analysis will focus on the range of planning activities which are possible and at what governmental level they might best be carried out.

Planning nonformal education at the national level

The discussion of planning at the national level will focus in turn on the issues of goals of planning, types of planning activities, and the institutional location of these planning efforts. The

planning of nonformal education will be notably different from the procedures commonly used to plan formal education at the national level. There should be no attempt to develop detailed quantitative plans which specify numbers of learners, specific content and numbers of institutions for the next five to ten years. Planning for nonformal education at the national level should be much more an exercise in what might be called 'minimal planning', where the emphasis is placed on policy alternatives and on the qualitative aspects of education.

What then should be the major *goals* of nonformal educational planning at the national level? The goals should include the following:

1. To participate with the planners of formal education in the development of an overall educational-sector analysis.
2. To articulate and assess the costs and benefits of alternative policies for the role of nonformal education in social and economic development.
3. To generate a broad map of the range of learning needs which can best be met by nonformal education in the different regions of the country.
4. To compile a general summary of major government-sponsored nonformal learning programmes and the larger private and commercial learning efforts which operate on a national basis.
5. To create and support effective regional-level planning capabilities for nonformal education and to assist them in obtaining co-operation from appropriate national ministries.

As is clear from this list, the major goal of national-level planning is one of working with planners of formal education to analyse basic policy alternatives within the entire education sector. The comparative advantages of various ways of providing educational services are assessed from both a rational, technical point of view and, equally important, a social and political perspective. The reader should review the last section of Chapter II in this context to note the difficult dilemma which faces planners in nonformal education.

A word needs to be said about a substantial component of the nonformal sector that has received relatively little attention, namely the work setting. A major source of learning of both technical skills and attitudes is the work-place. The work environ-

ment can be the family farm, the workshop of a craftsman, a service facility, a small manufacturer or a large-scale industry. In all these settings, workers learn by doing, by imitation, by receiving informal instruction from co-workers and supervisors, and sometimes by short structured learning activities. The working environment is a major generator of skills and knowledge that is often overlooked completely in the assessment of a nation's education sector. Although technically a part of the nonformal education component, the work environment is significant enough that consideration might be given to treating it as an explicit component along with the normal range of nonformal educational activities.

Setting national policies for nonformal education thus involves comparative analysis of formal education, nonformal education and education in the work environment. Planners may articulate the economic and technical bases for assigning different educational tasks to each of these components. Their analysis must then be tested in the area of political decision-making. The resulting process of dialogue and compromise will lead to a set of priorities for the development of both formal and nonformal education in the context of the national development goals.

The third and fourth goals listed above are part of the process of matching the distribution of learning needs with the existing set of delivery mechanisms for the purpose of identifying priorities for creating new programmes or expanding existing ones. The task of national-level planners is both to identify needs on a national aggregate basis and, more usefully, to suggest probable needs to each of the major regions of the country. The national-level planners should be pointing the way for the regions by raising their awareness of deficiencies and indicating how regional initiative can be compatible with nationally defined development goals.

Finally, national-level planners should undertake the task of helping to create the capacity and the competence for planning nonformal education at the regional level. The regional level will be the focus of whatever detailed planning occurs for nonformal education and will be the locus of the major efforts at co-ordination of different kinds of nonformal educational activities. The national level should help to develop procedures, possibly run some training courses, and generally facilitate the task of planning at the regional level. An important role at the national level will

be to promote co-operation among the different ministries involved in nonformal education. To achieve effective co-ordination at the regional level, political issues of competition between ministries will have to be addressed. Regional-level officials will be unable to facilitate effective co-operation without strong support at the national level.

What *planning activities* should be undertaken at the national level to achieve these goals? The formation of general policy requires two basic kinds of information: a reasonable understanding of the content and distribution of learning needs throughout the country; and a moderately comprehensive overview of the existing means of meeting those needs. Keeping in mind the realities of minimal planning, neither type of information should be collected with the kinds of detailed survey procedures characteristic of planning for formal education. The initial data may in fact be quite sketchy. A time horizon of three to five years might realistically be adopted during which increasingly complete sets of information would be accumulated. Fully detailed data on each programme and on highly specific sets of learning needs would *never* be assembled at the national level, but would become the task of each of the regions within the country.

The assessment of learning needs is a logical first step, but one which in the context of minimal planning is achievable only at a general level. The logical process involves looking at development goals, the economic and geographic characteristics of various regions, the present and planned development activities, and the current skill levels of the existing populations. Numerous examples of lists of general learning needs exist at both the international and the national level. They are of necessity general and serve primarily to illuminate the major categories of need. No pretence should be made that these lists are the basis for detailed programme planning. Their major purpose is to provide the planners with raw material for the difficult task of setting priorities among the major categories of learning needs, and of placing these priorities in the context of overall national development goals.

Attempting to draw up more detailed lists of learning needs is impractical from a resource point of view and, more important, is inappropriate. Only at the local-programme level can effective assessments of needs be made, and strong arguments exist for such a process including substantial participation on the part of

the learners themselves. Planners at both the national and the regional levels should not delude themselves that they know what kinds of skills and knowledge are needed, especially by poor rural people. The literature is full of examples from both formal and nonformal education of inappropriate projects based on learning needs articulated by planners living and working outside the areas for which the programmes were intended.

Needs assessment activities at the national level should consist of two components: sketching a broad set of needs nationally and for each region; and developing a set of methodologies which can be used for more detailed analysis at the regional level. The methodologies would assist the regions in working through population figures, data on stocks of educated manpower, current participation and completion rates, projections of population growth and so forth. Equal importance would be attached to calling to the attention of the regions the aspects of national-level development plans that will create new learning needs. For instance, large-scale irrigation projects, the development of major new industrial capacity or increased emphasis on diversification of cash crops would all have important implications for learning needs that could be met by nonformal educational approaches.

The second activity is the collection of information about large-scale nonformal educational activities in both the government and the private sector. At the national level, information should be restricted to those activities which serve large numbers of people already, or which are marked for substantial expansion across many regions of the country. Information should be restricted to basic data concerning numbers of participants, content areas of training, completion rates, and, most important, data on utilization of training after completion. Questions about which part of the population is being served are particularly important. Ultimately, national-level planners want to know which parts of the population do not have access to services and what learning needs of these people are not being met.

Planners must resist the temptation to undertake a thorough census of all out-of-school education efforts with detailed statistics on each programme. Surveys of this nature are a major undertaking and frequently yield results of marginal value in relationship to the cost of procuring the data. The abundant statistical information generated by such approaches has major shortcomings.

First, it can take many months to process the data into usable form and in the interim will provide planners with little policy guidance. Second, the data can be highly variable in terms of both quality and accuracy and are often out of date by the time the study is completed. Third, the cost of collecting the information is high not only for the planners but also for the practitioners, who must take valuable time away from their programmes to complete lengthy and complex forms. To the extent that any such detailed census activity should take place, it belongs at the regional level.

From these two kinds of data, planners can then prepare a general map which will highlight the major discrepancies between needs which are priority requirements for development and the existing capacities to meet those needs. This information then becomes the basis for planning expansions of the large-scale nonformal education activities, particularly those to be financed and managed by the government. Similarly, guidelines may be shared with the private sector to encourage them to develop their own activities in ways which complement government plans. Each of the regional planning bodies would receive both the overall national assessment and specific comments about the implications for the needs of the regions as seen from a national perspective.

The third activity of the national-level planners should focus on the development of regional and, in some large countries, subregional-level capacities to undertake their own planning. Activities would include drawing up plans for the organization and financing of planning at lower levels, development of manuals and methodologies for planning, and sponsoring training programmes for regional staff. The rapid development of the capacity of others to plan for themselves should be a clear priority of those at the national level. This basic principle will apply at each level, so that in the long run planning for nonformal education on a detailed level will take place as close to the programme users as is feasible. As planning capacities at lower levels increase, the focus at the national level will shift towards policy formulation and co-ordination of efforts and away from attempting to compile detailed information.

What *organizational structure* should be created for planning nonformal education at the national level? In keeping with the general approach of minimal planning and integration of nonfor-

mal education into the overall educational sector, planning for nonformal education should be a part of the existing educational planning structure. The advantages of such an approach are those associated with building on to an existing organization whose legitimacy is established. The disadvantages lie in the risk that the same philosophy and techniques which are now used for formal education will be applied to nonformal education as well. For this reason, it may be wise to seek to add staff to the planning unit whose experience and training will bring a new perspective to planning. To be effective, the whole approach to educational planning needs to be broadened to include the complete range of educational activities, but such a change will require some strong advocacy to overcome existing well-established quantitative practices for planning formal education.

In some situations, a better strategy may be to form an interministerial planning group which deals with all non-school educational activities. Such a group could contain a representative from the formal school planning unit, but could then be free to set wider and more flexible policies for dealing with nonformal education. In countries where there are large private sectors in nonformal education, representatives from those organizations ought to be included as well. Whether the interministerial body is of an advisory-policy planning nature, or also includes staff, will depend on the local setting. In light of the minimal planning approach, a planning group could operate only on an intermittent basis to set policy, with ongoing implementation delegated largely to the regional level authorities. Except perhaps in very large countries, one would not envision the creation of a separate planning apparatus for nonformal education.

Planning nonformal education at the regional level

The goals and activities discussed here for regional-level authorities are probably most appropriate for a middle- to large-sized country. Countries which are very small are likely to have to combine the national and regional-level activities in one or two locations, and then work directly at the programme level. The discussion in this section focuses primarily on those nonformal education activities which receive at least some of their resources

from the government. The relationship to totally non-government programmes would be more indirect and advisory.

The major goals for the regional level would include:

1. Translating national-level policies into clear sets of priorities and guidelines for nonformal education within the region.
2. Co-ordinating nonformal education, including direct supervision for government programmes and advice and indirect guidance for the non-government activities.
3. Developing and maintaining summary sets of information of general learning needs for the region and an inventory of nonformal education activities.
4. Creating and supporting mechanisms to provide direct planning and management assistance for staff of nonformal education programmes and projects.

The major goal of planning at this level is co-ordination of efforts throughout the entire range of nonformal education activities in the regions. Co-ordination will involve several different kinds of processes. First, it means getting the various ministries that have nonformal education activities, which usually includes education, agriculture, rural development, and possibly health and labour as well, to work together. Second, it involves the more general co-ordination between the government and the non-government activities. Most of the co-ordination will have to be on an informal voluntary basis, so the process will have to demonstrate to the participants that the results are worth the effort.

The creation and dissemination of some fairly clear guidelines and priorities for the region, backed up by summary data, would be of considerable help to all those involved. In identifying the components of learning needs and indicating what parts of the population have these needs and approximately where they are located, they will provide all programmes with a better basis for planning. Setting up information-exchange mechanisms and encouraging sharing of both current activities and future plans would greatly facilitate the development of region-wide co-ordination. Conflicts, duplication and competition between programmes will certainly occur. Helping to reach compromises and pointing out new areas where programmes can expand would lead to the development of a more cohesive regional effort over time.

At this level, even more than at the national level, rather than concentrating on planning for them a major goal should be the

development of the capacity of programmes to plan for themselves. Detailed planning should be located within programmes, and for many should include substantial participation on the part of the learners themselves. The task of the regional-level officials is to develop and support this capability with training, guidelines, information on priorities and suggested methodologies.

Finally, an important goal in all areas involves the articulation of regional needs and characteristics to the national level. The region has the responsibility of gathering information and analysing it in such a way as to provide clear statements to the national level. The upward flow of information and comments can take the form of comments on nationally formulated goals and policies, as well as comments and statements initiated on the basis of the situation in the region. Particularly in nonformal education, facilitating the upward flow of issues is an important task. To ensure that it happens, the region will need to set up conscious procedures which will make such dialogue at the same time feasible and likely.

The *activities* for planning at the regional level will vary considerably with the size of the region and the extent of the nonformal activities. The processes will depend on the nature of the region. Regions containing large urban centres are likely to have an active commercial training sector with which to deal, while very rural regions may have many fewer activities, along with the special problems of seasonal migrations or nomadic groups. Whatever the level of effort, the primary focus should be on facilitating effective programmes rather than on control and direction of the programmes.

Activities to support co-ordination should focus on two tasks: providing clear information about current and future needs; and facilitating effective joint planning of efforts. The kinds of information most needed include clear indications of priorities among competing needs and current levels of effort to meet those needs. What are the general types of learning needs? What people have these needs and where are these people located? Which organizations already have the capability to meet these needs, and which programmes could most effectively expand to meet needs which will arise in the future? Regional officials may wish to put out an annual summary statement on nonformal education which is circulated to all concerned groups. Or even better, a representative

group of staff from existing programmes and clientèle could meet to prepare such a report.

Equally important will be the task of setting up and supporting regular forums where programmes operating in the same area can get together and work out effective joint plans for the future. Where competition and conflict exist, regional officials will have to devise strategies to promote compromise. In some cases this may mean involving higher-level officials, particularly where government programmes are concerned. For large regions, the creation of smaller advisory and planning councils for subregions may be desirable. Regional efforts should be devoted to providing a venue and whatever technical support is necessary to make such co-ordination take place.

Activities to support the collection of information on needs and programmes should be directed primarily at constructing general maps which highlight issues of distribution. Neither detailed needs assessment nor comprehensive census data on programmes should be sought on a region-wide basis. The purpose is primarily that of informing all those active in nonformal education in the region of the distribution of discrepancies between needs and services. Rather than undertaking very specific needs analysis—which is an activity best done by local programmes—regional-level officials should seek to describe the general characteristics of the population by age, sex, amount of education and likely opportunities for employment. This kind of information on a district or subregional basis will quickly suggest the most likely kinds of needs in a particular area.

Likewise a summary of existing programmes by area can be kept without collecting great amounts of statistical detail on each programme. Rather each district might be described in a summary fashion according to what programmes are operating, their approximate size, and the major clientèle which they are serving. These data, when combined with basic population information, would highlight the most likely unmet needs. Further study and analysis should be left to programmes working in the area which want to expand their efforts. Regional officials should work with programme officials to assist them in assessing local needs. Summaries of the results could then be used to update the information kept at the regional level.

Activities in support of programme planning and management

capabilities should have a high priority. These would include running regular training sessions for staff from various programmes; developing manuals on planning and management; providing consulting services to programmes which wanted assistance in improving their effectiveness; providing sample instruments and training in their use for needs assessment; and assisting programmes in finding qualified staff when vacancies occurred. In larger regions, such activities might effectively be carried out by a regional training centre where regular courses could be held. For smaller regions, ways to use existing school or private facilities could be sought. In some cases, technical assistance may have to be sought from national-level organizations on a temporary basis. The more effective the training activities, the more the locus of planning will be transferred to the programmatic level. This approach is particularly desirable when working with small programmes which are completely outside any government effort.

The options for *organizational structure* at the regional level are diverse and depend heavily on the size of the region and the amount of activity there. Clearly, for a region of moderate size some permanent staff would be required to carry out the range of activities just discussed. The location of these staff members could be in any of several organizations. If there is a regional planning body which includes education then that would possibly be the ideal location because it would facilitate liaison with activities in ministries outside of education. Otherwise the likely location is in the regional education office along with personnel responsible for activities like adult education and literacy. In that case the formation of regional-level advisory and co-ordinating bodies would be essential.

For very large regions most of the activities which have been discussed here should be delegated to district level. In addition, some sort of regional training and support facility might become feasible and would support the district activities. Several countries in Asia are now developing regional centres for training, materials development and general support of government nonformal-education programmes. The activities of these centres ought to be enlarged to include the planning activities and associated training. For small regions with low levels of activity the planning functions may have to be delegated to voluntary efforts on the part of

staff from one or more private organizations. Governments might provide a small subsidy to encourage organizations to undertake the responsibility. Finally, consideration might be given to involving universities or training colleges in some of the planning activities, particularly those related to data analysis and training. Extra financial support would be needed, but in some cases this would be more cost-effective than it would be to create the same capability on a full-time basis within the government. There is no need for planning in nonformal education to be solely or even primarily a government activity. Once this is realized, alternative organizational approaches become both feasible and attractive.

Planning nonformal education at the programme level

The discussion until this point has focused primarily on system-planning efforts. Planning at the programme level is not the focus of this monograph and is relevant only in that a major task of the system efforts is to develop and support the capacity of programmes to plan for themselves. It is at the programme level that the most meaningful efforts can and should take place to decide what is going to be offered to whom and with what methods. Traditional programme planning involves a sequence of: needs assessment, formation of goals and objectives, evaluation of alternative procedures for meeting the objectives, monitoring of implementation, and evaluation of the outcomes. The reader should seek out references which detail the actual steps involved in programme planning and management for further information.

One caution is in order. All too frequently when programmes are designed the result is very close to the school model. Use should be made of the dimensions which were discussed in Chapter II as a basis for designing programmes in response to specific needs in a particular situation. The dimensions will assist the planner in actively considering the full range of alternatives for each major component such as staffing, learning methodology and locus of responsibility. Failure to make use of alternatives can jeopardize the effectiveness of the resulting programme and may increase the cost of operating it. The closer a programme design is to the school model, the more likely it is to duplicate the costs and other characteristics of the school approach.

The principle of helping others learn to plan rather than plan-

ning for them should be equally applied at the programme level. Learner participation in programme planning should be part of most nonformal education efforts. Participatory planning helps to develop skills in the learners; motivates them to complete the training; and can help to insure the maximum relevance of the content to the needs of the learners. The degree of participation can and should vary, but the principle that learners should learn to plan for themselves is an essential component of the goal of self-reliance. If planning for nonformal education becomes a highly centralized process and programmes are implemented in the same fashion, nonformal education will lose much of its comparative strengths in contrast to the formal system.

Planning issues raised by selected types of nonformal education programmes

In this section, discussion will shift from general issues of planning to a look at specific issues which are raised by some of the more common types of government-supported nonformal education programmes. Care should be taken, however, *not* to interpret these categories as ones specially recommended for nonformal education programmes. Planning should always proceed, as presented in the previous section, by working from assessment of needs, identification of clientèle, and then the design of appropriate programmatic responses. The presentation here is organized under the heading of some selected programme types in order to facilitate the discussion of specific issues.

Four common types of programmes will be discussed. They are chosen because planners are likely to be confronted by suggestions that programmes be designed in one or other of the categories. The categories reflect existing programmes in many settings because they represent responses to commonly found constraints. The categories by no means represent the most desirable or the most efficient way of organizing nonformal education.

The four categories to be discussed are:

School-based learning centres.
Nonformal youth programmes.
Adult basic education and community development.
Vocational skill training.

The issues discussed under each category reflect both positive and

negative aspects which must be considered by planners in planning for such programmes.

School-based learning centres. This category is popular because of the reality that the great bulk of expenditures for education are and will continue to be used for schools. The network of schools and teachers provides the most extensive penetration of services of any branch of the government and therefore forms a potential base of nonformal education activities. There are several advantages to using the school system. First, the physical facilities, whether they are schools or farm-training centres, can often be used at little or no additional cost outside regular class hours. Second, a staff of teachers and administrators already exists and, within certain limits, they can be used to help run nonformal programmes. In many countries, primary school teachers are involved in literacy teaching, organizing courses and providing supervision. Lastly, the community conceives of the school as a place of learning and thus as a natural location for additional learning activities. But the main advantage remains the size and the scope of the formal system and the firm commitment which it has on the part of the people and the government.

There are many existing models for school-based nonformal-education activities. These include literacy classes, primary-school equivalency classes for adults, community discussion and learning groups, programmes to teach handicrafts and low-level technical skills, and learning groups based on radio or television transmissions. Where more ambitious programmes are undertaken, new facilities and staff are added to existing buildings. Some approaches focus on serving non-school-age populations after school hours, while others emphasize the opening up of the school programme and its integration more fully into the community. The community-school model exemplifies the latter approach. Adults are brought into the school both as learners and as learning resources for children. Children go out into the homes, shops, artisans' work-places and production settings in the village to work and learn. The school becomes more than just a learning centre; it becomes the core of the whole development process for the community.

Building on the existing school structure is an attractive strategy, especially if cost economies arising from more efficient use of

buildings and staff can be achieved. However, these models do have disadvantages. Because schools are a well-established system with strong traditions and a large supporting bureaucracy, they present problems to those wanting to run different kinds of programmes within that structure. In the minds of both parents and teachers, schools are places where children sit in rows while the teachers maintain discipline and give out knowledge which pupils write down in their books. These concepts and the processes surrounding them are well established and resistant to change. Illiterate parents have often been embarrassed to attend meetings in schools; for them school is a place for children. Teachers are not about to change their teacher-centred methods of lecture and drill, for that is what they best know how to do. In short, the practice of teachers lecturing to rows of silent learners struggling to record the teachers' words is very difficult to modify and is largely inappropriate for the clientèle and the content of nonformal education.

Leaving aside the difficulty of changing teaching methods, there is the very real fact that most teachers are employed full-time under already challenging conditions. As many rural teachers are among the few educated people in their village, they are often called upon to undertake other activities. Many literacy campaigns and nonformal programmes whose staff consisted of primary school teachers working after school have failed to achieve their goals. In reality, there is little uncommitted time in the lives of teachers, particularly if the additional work is on a volunteer basis or provides very low additional pay. In fact, because of low salaries and frequent long delays in being paid, many teachers have other jobs already. Offering substantial extra pay for extra work is not really a solution either. The costs to the programme are too high and they result in teachers neglecting their duties as primary school teachers. From a planning perspective, the moral is clear: simply adding new responsibilities to existing duties of teachers has not been found to be a viable way of staffing nonformal education programmes.

The whole issue of staffing nonformal education programmes needs further thought. Many programmes have been short-term and have relied with varying degrees of success on volunteer efforts by both educational staff and others. If, however, programmes are to be ongoing, then some paid full-time staff

becomes essential to maintain activities. For the reasons discussed in the previous paragraph, experience has found that teachers are unlikely candidates for this role. At the same time, training and deploying a staff of full-time nonformal educators leads ultimately to a situation parallel to that of school, where most schooling costs are professional salaries. In the past, compromise strategies have involved such devices as giving release time to teachers from school responsibilities, or restructuring the nature of school activities so that nonformal education was integrated more directly into the programme. Staff then shared responsibility for all educational activities. Planners should be aware that they must provide for staffing needs directly, and not expect existing school personnel to perform as extras.

If nonformal education is going to be school-based, there are other issues to be considered as well. Planners are familiar with the fact that schools tend to serve the children of the wealthier and more modern sectors of the population more than they do the children of poorer and more traditional sectors. Placing nonformal-education programmes in school facilities will therefore tend to continue this trend rather than reverse it, unless planners take conscious steps to improve services for poorer areas. For many potential clients such as drop-outs and illiterate youth and adults, schools may be associated either with personal failure or, in some cases, with systematic prejudice against members of their group. In short, for many of the intended clientèle of nonformal-education programmes, schools are the institutions which have in the past failed to serve them. Persuading prospective learners that schools are indeed places where they will be welcomed and can receive genuine assistance may be difficult. The difficulty may be increased if learners find the same teachers there, using essentially the same educational methods.

Planners may well respond to these comments by saying that theirs is a problem of too many people demanding services rather than too few. While this may often be the case, the real issue is one of who is being served by the educational programmes. Those most in need are often not those clamouring to get into schools. Many of those wanting to attend school-based education programmes are those who have already had some education and are interested in upgrading their qualifications or in re-entering formal education by an indirect route. Planners must be clear which part

of the population a programme is intended to reach. There may be a need, in some cases, to act to prevent the programme from being filled by those for whom it is not intended.

If schools are to become effective bases for nonformal education programmes changes in the physical facilities may be necessary. Most adults, for example, are physically unable to sit on furniture designed for young primary-school children. Some provision for furniture of a more flexible kind or for additional furniture would be necessary. In addition, provision would have to be made for improved lighting, so that buildings could be used in late afternoons and evenings. In order to use school buildings for skill training, additional facilities would have to be designed and built as well, particularly where programming was extensive enough to require activities during the day when children are in the school. Finally, the optimal location of schools might well be different if their intended clientèle was taken as the whole population rather than just the school-age group. When selecting sites for new schools planners should carefully consider the needs and the distribution of other age groups as well.

The above discussion has attempted to outline some of the pros and cons of school-based programmes. On balance, there are a number of factors which suggest that such programming should be taken seriously by planners. School-based programmes are most likely to be successful when the content is such that fairly traditional didactic methods are appropriate, and when the intended clientèle is already familiar with schools and is likely to feel comfort in such an environment. Thus, programmes for skill training in handicrafts and courses designed to maintain and upgrade literacy or numeracy skills would be appropriate. Programmes for initial basic education of populations in economically undeveloped regions may not be appropriate for location in schools. Other options are available, and should be used to supplement the school-based approach, depending on the goals and the clientèle.

A particularly productive strategy for planners with regard to schools may be to concentrate on reducing the time spent on formal school activities, thereby freeing staff and facilities for more extensive efforts in nonformal educational programmes. Planners are already familiar with this stratgy in the form of double shifts for schools, but they have less frequently considered

reducing school time so as to serve other sectors of the population. The advantage of the latter approach is its utilization of the existing investment in staff and facilities. The opportunity costs to existing school pupils are low, since reductions in class time, within limits, seem to have little effect on the amount of learning which takes place. The difficulty is to resist the strong pressures to use the newly available resources to admit more pupils. Policy-makers will have to make clear that the priority is to serve non-school parts of the population.

Whatever the strategy used, the school-based component of nonformal-education programmes is likely to become increasingly important. When such programmes are proposed, planners must remember the limitations involved. Teachers' roles need to be realistically redefined; more flexible physical facilities must be created; and additional resources will be needed for use solely in the nonformal-education activities at the schools. Care should be taken to resist the natural tendency to assume that most nonformal education can be appropriately located at schools. The limitations discussed above are serious. Many programmes cannot and should not be part of school-based efforts.

Nonformal youth programmes. One can select many different groups of potential clientèle, such as women, or farmers, or urban unemployed. Why focus on youth? Youth, particularly unemployed primary school leavers, form a large, mobile and visible group which can be a potentially disruptive force. From a more positive point of view, youth also represent a valuable source of motivated and energetic manpower for development. In many countries, out-of-school youth number hundreds of thousands and planners must devise means for meeting some of their needs and involving them in the process of national development. Existing programmes for out-of-school youth can be roughly grouped into two categories: large-scale, national, youth-service efforts; and small-scale programmes which often combine low-level skill training with recreational activities.

Youth-service schemes typically operate at the national level. Because of their political overtones, they are often run by a separate organization directly responsible to the national executive office. Thus educational planners, particularly at the regional levels, will have little opportunity to become directly involved in the

planning of such schemes. Planners will, however, need to get involved in co-ordinating other educational activities with the youth service. This would include activities prior to entrance into the youth service, and, more important, the difficult task of absorbing graduates of the programme back into society and meeting whatever further educational needs they might have. Depending on the size of the programme, national service will provide opportunities for a certain proportion of the youth in the planner's region. The planner will have to consider other activities for those who do not join, or those who are waiting for the opportunity to join.

In a national perspective, youth service is an important nonformal educational activity for several reasons. The size of the operation is of primary importance. In many countries, the national youth service is several times larger than all the other non-school youth programmes combined. Even so, they typically serve only a small percentage of the total out-of-school youth population. Youth service provides a visible and constructive outlet for the energies of youth, and provides them with a variety of opportunities to learn useful skills. Included in the 'curriculum' of such programmes are usually such things as socialization into the national goals, experience with a structure and discipline which promotes hard work, and a chance to mature and develop leadership skills in the face of challenging tasks. Many such programmes (e.g. in Guyana and Tanzania) employ their own graduates in staff positions and, in some cases, provisions are made for subsequent government employment, for entrance into the armed forces or for preferred consideration for higher levels of formal education. Graduates who return to their home areas are often formed into cadres to stimulate development activities on the part of others. Where the latter is the case, planners will be well advised to formulate activities of an educational nature which makes use of their leadership capabilities.

The other kinds of programmes for youth are often small in scale and are sponsored by private voluntary or community groups. For these programmes the planner's role is one of general co-ordination and facilitation. Efforts should be devoted to strengthening those programmes which best meet local needs and to identifying unmet needs for which new efforts are necessary. Since these efforts are usually locally run and financed, detailed

planning is best left in the hands of the sponsoring organizations. Planners should consider strategies such as forming advisory councils made up of representatives of all the organizations active in youth work in the region, thus facilitating the exchange of information and the co-ordination of efforts. Thought should also be given to establishing training courses for the leaders of such programmes in order to improve their programme planning and management skills. The major thrust is seen as one of helping organizations and programme leaders do a better job of planning for themselves.

The low-level skill-training activities which are typical of this category of youth programmes have one common deficiency of which planners should be conscious. Education does not usually create employment: providing someone with the skill to do carpentry work, raise chickens or repair radios neither guarantees them employment nor does it prepare them to become self-employed. A common assumption of any such programmes is that because there are people who want the training, there is need for and the capability to use such people in the economy. Experience shows that such is often not the case. Many programme leaders hope that their graduates will become self-employed, if there is no immediate employer. All too often however, programmes overlook the other inputs which are necessary if an individual is to go into business. A person must have tools, access to spare parts or suitable raw materials, and above all the ability to find customers, to handle finances and to plan activities. Such skills are rarely covered in training and therefore graduates are not likely to be able to use their skills in the community even when a potential demand exists there.

The classical example of this problem is the training of landless youth in farming skills which they have no way of applying. Recognition of this problem has led to a variety of settlement schemes where the whole range of inputs needed is available to new settlers, including training. Programmes of this type have been quite successful, despite high overall costs. While such programmes illustrate one solution to the problem, they can never cater to more than a small number of youths. Agricultural training is usually more appropriate for those who are already farming and who can be provided with the means to improve their methods.

Structure for a variety of nonformal educational activities for

youth is desirable and planners will have to take responsibility for the creation of such a framework. The planning approach is likely to be a combination of co-ordination with whatever national programmes exist and co-ordination and encouragement of a variety of smaller local approaches within each region. The existence of a general framework of youth organization makes various programmes and activities possible without having to create a new structure for each of them. Such an ongoing network also facilitates the involvement of youth in periodic development efforts and in nationally sponsored activities as the occasions arise. Although the form of such an organization may vary greatly depending on local and national circumstances, planners will benefit from having some way of communicating systematically with the youth of their region.

Adult basic education and community development. This category contains activities which focus on basic literacy and numeracy, development of community activities, and basic health, nutrition and family-planning activities. Activities of this type usually take priority in planning nonformal education for relatively less developed regions where participation in the modern economy is low, where general literacy is low, and where traditional social structures are still strong. While most of the educational activities might be carried out as school-based or as youth programmes, another approach is often more appropriate.

Where illiteracy is high and formal schooling is available only to a few, planners will have to give priority to programmes which provide basic education to a much wider group of people. Assuming that substantial expansion of the school system is not feasible financially, then serious attention must be given to nonformal alternatives. Different strategies will be adopted, depending on the emphasis of the programme. Programmes placing major emphasis on the development of a sense of community and the organization of people to solve their own problems may opt for participative approaches which stress consciousness-raising and group efforts and place less initial emphasis on specific skills like literacy. Programmes conceived primarily to improve specific skills of individuals, in the hope that they can improve their lives, may tend to utilize more didactic teaching methods which emphasize the transfer of information and skills from a teacher to the learners.

The role of the regional-level planner should be one of co-ordination of existing efforts and stimulation of new ones. Where active national literacy or community-development programmes exist, the task is one of co-ordination and adaptation to meet local needs of the region. Existing local efforts should be stimulated and co-operation encouraged. Where few efforts exist planners will have to seek ways to create new activities. For this category of educational activities, preference probably should be given to motivating communities, private organizations and volunteer groups to undertake needed programmes rather than to the setting up of government-operated programmes. Planners can recommend a variety of ways in which government funds can be used to stimulate local efforts. Grants can be made available for proposed programmes that fall within priorities defined by the planners, or matching funds can be made available to groups which raise certain amounts on their own. Where local skills are not adequate for such approaches, planners may have to organize training courses which give people the basic skills needed to plan programmes and apply for financial assistance from the government.

The temptation to plan extensive government operations in this category should be resisted. Resources are often not readily available for such an effort and, by promising to do things for people, there is a risk of reducing their motivation to take responsibility themselves. Government efforts might best be aimed at training and supporting local leaders who can initiate nonformal-education programmes with local support. To plan and manage such a process requires patience and sophistication. False starts, failures, conflicts and confusion will be commonplace initially, as people learn by doing. With help and guidance, programmes will gradually emerge that are feasible and which enjoy genuine support and commitment on the part of local citizens. The planner's role in this process becomes one of education, of motivation and of setting overall procedures within which others work.

One strategy worthy of thought in this context is the establishment of a regional educational-resource centre. The function of such a centre would be that of a training location for leaders' education activities, ranging from fairly formal literacy and basic education courses, to participatory groups aimed at general community development. In addition to training, centre staff could

provide support and supervision and could assist programmes in solving a variety of organizational problems. The power of this approach lies in its flexibility. No single type of programme is prescribed for all villages. Rather the centre supports leaders who are using a variety of approaches through the provision of training and materials. The emphasis remains on community initiative, and increasingly the centre would function to help people to solve their own problems, rather than providing ready-made answers. Such regional resource centres for nonformal education are thought to be feasible with lower levels of resources, and probably can be implemented without direct government control of all activities. Such a centre could also serve as a convenient vehicle to promote co-ordinated activity between the various ministries involved in rural development.

Finally, it is worth noting, in this context, that some of the problems of underdevelopment in certain regions may be the result of systematic neglect on the part of the government. Change often comes about only when communities organize themselves and establish sufficient power to force a more equitable treatment. A certain amount of conflict may result, and this may be a healthy part of the overall development process as people begin to become active on their own behalf. Planners who are genuinely interested in the development of previously neglected regions should realize that tolerance is necessary in order that local structures develop. They should also recognize that government-sponsored and carefully controlled programmes will probably be antithetical to development. Confronting such situations is difficult for government civil servants. One needs to be aware that in most situations there is, in fact, considerable latitude to look the other way or even tacitly to encourage local initiative.

As the discussion above suggests, this area is one of the most difficult for planners. On the one hand, local capability and activity is vital for any meaningful development to take place: on the other hand, that vitality can only grow with a policy of indirect planning and encouragement. For this category of activities, the planner must function primarily as a facilitator who helps others to see the needs and find ways to encourage non-governmental groups to take initiative. This is indeed a challenging task for government civil servants in a national planning body.

Vocational-skill training. The educational efforts discussed in this section do not include the vocational training provided by full-time technical schools which train people for regular examinations. That kind of education is normally planned in ways similar to formal education and falls outside the area being discussed in this monograph. For the immediate discussion vocational-skill training can be divided roughly into two levels: introductory, low-level training, usually for younger adults; and higher-level training for workers being upgraded in their jobs or those seeking direct employment in a modern industry. Nonformal education is primarily concerned with the low-level training; but the higher level is sometimes included in the planning literature.

The higher level of training is characterized by the need for more complex equipment for training, previous training or comparable experience for entry, and often involves examinations leading to certificates of one kind or another. Such training is important primarily in the modern sectors of the economy where there are real demands from employers for trained personnel. Because of its high cost, and the need for a direct relationship with potential employers, such training should take place as close as possible to the industrial setting in which the graduates will be hired. In many cases, this means training within the industry, possibly with cost subsidies from the government. If not within the industries, then such training should be planned and executed with direct participation by employers to ensure the relevance of the training. Many countries have models where such training is financed by payroll taxes or other levies on industry itself and where the employers have a direct say in the training content. This direct linkage to industry is necessary because of the cost of equipment for training and the relatively rapid rate at which the content becomes obsolete. Careful, detailed planning for this type of training should take place. The training capacity should be closely limited to the actual needs of employers.

Low-level skill training is more characteristic of most nonformal programmes. Typical of this type of training are the wide range of apprenticeship programmes and trade and homecraft training offered for primary school leavers and young adults. Also typical of this category is a wide variety of commercial training enterprises which flourish in the larger cities of most countries. Characteristic courses in typing, shorthand, key-punch operating, weld-

ing, radio servicing, and automobile repair. Many are offered on a fee basis to all who are interested. Fees are high and are intended to cover all costs, including profits for the firm organizing the course. In some cases assistance is offered by the organizers in finding employment. In most instances, nothing is offered beyond a certificate of completion of the course.

Planning policy with regard to such commercial enterprises should focus on preventing abuses in advertising, false promises of guaranteed employment, and failure to provide an acceptable minimum standard of training. Planners should concentrate on collecting and publicizing information about short- and medium-term needs in the job market for various skills to help both clients and firms make appropriate decisions about the kinds of skill training which are needed. In short, planning should be restricted to providing signals which help the private market to respond effectively to the needs of employers. Except in unusual circumstances, governments should be involved neither in providing training nor in helping to finance it. Training costs for such skills are appropriately borne by the learner to whom most of the benefits will accrue. Only where special demands for more equitable access to such training exist on the part of disadvantaged populations should the government consider intervening, and then perhaps only with a fee-subsidy arrangement.

In rural settings, training is unlikely to be available on a commercial basis, primarily because the clientèle will not have the resources to pay the fees. Programmes are likely to be offered by local volunteer organizations or by community-sponsored efforts. Government planning efforts should be limited to assessments of likely employment opportunities, co-ordination of efforts to prevent extensive overlap of efforts, and guidance to help programme sponsors to improve the quality of their efforts. In rural areas, financial subsidies of various kinds may be appropriate, to stimulate needed activities or to match funds raised locally. In general, governments should resist the temptation to organize their own courses.

The reasons for caution in this area are similar to those mentioned above in the youth programme section. There is no necessary relationship between training and the application of the training in a productive way. Particularly, for low-level training given to young adults, the chance of employment in an already existing

job is relatively small. Self-employment is not a real option without considerable effort to provide other types of training as well as the complementary inputs needed. Thus the result of simple skill training is often increased frustration when the learner discovers that opportunities to use the training do not exist. Added to this difficulty are the common problems of finding teachers who can teach vocational skills, getting equipment which is needed, and providing supplies which are consumed during the training course.

The planning implications of vocational training lie in helping programme developers to understand the realities of the employment market. Programme goals should be clear. General vocational skill training to provide basic skills for use in a family setting or to lay the groundwork for more technical training later on are legitimate goals, but they should not be confused with training for direct employment. When the goals are clear, planners can help sponsors decide on the appropriateness of programmes in the light of their costs. Expensive types of skill training are probably inappropriate for clientèle who have little chance of using the skills after training. The same resources could be better used for activities designed to generate employment opportunities, with most training being done directly on the job.

Because of these problems, both low- and high-level training programmes will justify more planning efforts on the part of regional and national-level personnel than other areas of nonformal education. The costs of training and the likelihood of inappropriate training are such that more detailed planning and control by government is needed, except for the urban commercial sector. Planning is also fairly feasible, because the number of people involved in such programmes is relatively small. The most acute problem will be co-ordinating the efforts of different ministries. There are also risks that formal vocational school programmes will be launched because of political pressures created by the large number of unemployed people. Such formal programmes have all the same problems, coupled with higher costs and greater risks of obsolete content. Vocational skill training at the higher levels is probably the one area of nonformal education where formal school planning techniques make sense and should be used.

The discussion of planning issues raised by the four categories of

nonformal-education programmes mentioned above has served to highlight a series of points for planners to consider. A cautionary reminder is needed though. The four categories are not part of a planning process for nonformal education. Planning should work from needs derived from both learners' aspirations and overall economic development. Design of programmes should follow these needs and should not be based on categories. There are many good nonformal-education programmes which would not fit easily into the categories discussed above. The issues discussed within the categories often transcend the category itself and will be of use in planning other nonformal education activities.

The cost of nonformal education

Many of the basic issues in the area of costs have already been discussed at appropriate points of this monograph. At this stage in the development of nonformal education there are relatively few systematic cost data which can be used to provide guidelines for planners. This section will therefore be restricted to summarizing the key components in the cost of nonformal education programmes, with the goal of making planners aware of the basic options available to them. Predictions as to real costs for projected programmes, especially those envisioned on a national level, are generally not possible since little experience exists as yet with large-scale nonformal education programmes.

The basic components of costs for nonformal education are the same as for school programmes: staff salaries and benefits, capital costs for buildings and equipment, costs for usable supplies, and the cost of the learners' time. No planner will be surprised to learn that staff costs dominate most nonformal programmes as they do those of formal school programmes. A simple ground rule for costing nonformal education would be to remember that the more an out-of-school or nonformal educational programme resembles schooling in its form, the closer its costs are to those of schooling. This rule of thumb is particularly accurate for recurrent costs, and less so for capital costs since nonformal education is seldom involved in the construction of special, single-purpose buildings.

Experience has shown that there are some very real limits to the use of volunteers, particularly if a programme is to continue over a long period of time. The volunteers who are effective at

their work begin to realize after a while that they are working without pay, providing essentially the same services for which teachers are being paid. To keep such people, they either must be somehow paid, or must be given other rewards which are satisfying. Otherwise programmes will have to plan on a high turnover rate and the need for continual staff training.

But readers should note carefully that the products of schooling are quite different from the products of most nonformal education, and the 'savings' must be evaluated in terms of the value of the output. To the extent that nonformal education produces more appropriate skills and attitudes for development than formal schooling, then to that extent the savings are real and desirable. If the goal is really the same output as schooling, then most programmes tend to produce a set of results of lower quality, although there are some efficient school-equivalency programmes which are cheaper and seem to produce comparable results. This discussion of benefits really applies to all aspects of the costs, but seems particulary appropriate at this point since the quality of the staff is probably the key ingredient which determines the quality of the educational product.

The lowered capital costs derive almost entirely from utilizing buildings and equipment at times when they are not otherwise occupied. Costs are reduced to those associated with maintenance and accelerated depreciation. The limits to this saving lie in the upper limits of the under-utilized capacity. When programmes expand to deal with large populations then there may come a time when new buildings are needed, and the savings will be much reduced. At the moment, though, most nonformal education programmes are small in scale and do not face this problem. But programmes such as national youth-service camps, which operate on a large scale, must build or acquire their own facilities and their capital costs are much more comparable with those of schools.

Other costs such as administration, supervision and staff travel are also small, but will increase rapidly when programmes expand to a large scale. Planners should therefore be wary of cost figures derived from small pilot programmes and particularly those with external support in the form of trained manpower. Mounting nationally staffed and financed programmes on a larger scale is likely to result in substantial cost increases. Substantial savings

may still be possible in the area of staffing, but even that possibility may be limited when programmes become lengthened and institutionalized. At that point volunteers will make legitimate demands for salaries and benefits comparable to those of other professionals and the total costs will rapidly approach those of schooling.

Underlying the direct costs of nonformal education are more basic issues relating to social equity and the role of nonformal education in national development. Large amounts of public funds are spent on the schooling of one part of society, while small marginal amounts are made available to nonformal education for the remaining parts of society. Is it appropriate to ask users of nonformal education to pay part of the costs associated with their training, when the majority of the costs of schooling are not paid by those attending school? Perhaps there comes a stage in national development when more of the cost of schooling should be paid by the learners, thereby freeing resources for the expansion of nonformal education. Dealing with the cost implications of nonformal education will of necessity involve analysing the allocation of resources across the entire educational sector.

Concluding comments

This chapter has outlined a suggested set of procedures, both general and specific, for planners facing the challenging task of planning nonformal education. Two general principles underlie the suggested approach. First, the amount of planning for nonformal education should be limited, with planning responsibility placed as close to the learners as possible. For many small-scale programmes, planning should be in the hands of the learners and the sponsoring group at the local level. At the regional level, the emphasis should be on co-ordination of effort and the stimulation of activity by various governmental organizations. At the national level, planning should be a matter of general policy and overall co-ordination with national development goals. The major goal of planning efforts should be the facilitation of planning by communities and districts for themselves, and the gradual increase in their abilities to carry out this task.

The second major principle is the use of a differentiated set of planning procedures depending on the characteristics of the pro-

gramme being planned. Size, cost and complexity become criteria which govern the extent to which government planning is appropriate for any particular programme or sector of activities. The suggested philosophy emphasizes a minimal planning approach, which might be characterized as a philosophy of 'less is better'. Major emphasis has been placed on the regional-level planner with the dual task of co-ordination and facilitation. A significant part of the facilitation effort lies in providing training and guidance for district and local-level organizations as they go about planning for themselves.

The strengths of nonformal education lie in its diversity, its vitality and its ability to respond quickly and creatively to local needs. A decade of experience with attempts to develop nonformal education has sharpened awareness of its limitations and reafirmed its value in meeting many of the learning needs of developing countries. Nonformal education has demonstrated its capability of carrying out many educational tasks which cannot and should not be attempted in schools. The future development of nonformal education lies in its integration into the overall educational sector along with formal education. Planning for nonformal education must function to encourage its strengths while providing an overall framework within which it can grow in a manner consistent with the goals of national development.

IV. Finding further information

The following is a limited list of references selected on the basis of their potential usefulness to planners and their availability to practitioners in the field. Unfortunately, much of the dialogue about important issues in out-of-school and nonformal education has taken place in academic journals and papers not easily obtainable outside Europe and north America. Issues from these sources which seem most relevant have been included in the body of the text. Readers seeking more complete bibliographies should refer to the citations in the works listed here.

The sources are divided into three sections. The first is a limited list of basic references. The second contains the addresses and brief descriptions of the activities of some of the more active institutions in the field of nonformal education. Some of the documents produced by these institutions are available without charge. The third section contains the names of several newsletters which will help keep the reader informed about continuing development in the field.

Selected basic references

AHMED, Manzoor. *The economics of nonformal education: resources, costs, and benefits.* New York, Praeger, 1975.

AHMED, M., and COOMBS, P. (eds.). *Education for rural development: case studies for planners.* New York, Praeger, 1975.

CARNOY, M. *Education and employment: a critical appraisal.* Paris, Unesco/International Institute for Educational Planning, 1977. (Fundamentals of educational planning 26.)

COOMBS, Philip H. *The world educational crisis: a systems analysis.* New York, London, Toronto, Oxford University Press, 1968.

COOMBS, P., and AHMED, M. *Attacking rural poverty: nonformal education can help.* Baltimore, Md, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.

FURTER, P. *The planner and lifelong education.* Paris, Unesco/International Institute for Educational Planning, 1977. (Fundamentals of educational planning 25.)

GILLETTE, A. *New trends in service by youth.* New York, United Nations, 1971.

– *Beyond the nonformal fashion: towards educational revolution in Tanzania.* Amherst, Mass., University of Massachusetts, Center for International Education, 1977.

GRANDSTAFF, M. *Nonformal education and an expanded conception of development.* East Lansing, Mich., Michigan State University, Program of Studies in Nonformal Education, 1974. (Discussion paper 1.)

HARBISON, F. H. *Human resources as the wealth of nations.* New York, Oxford University Press, 1973.

LABELLE, T. J. *Nonformal education and social change in Latin America.* Los Angeles, Calif., University College of Los Angeles Latin American Center, 1976.

PAULSTON, R. G. *Nonformal education: an annotated international bibliography.* New York, Praeger, 1972.

PHILLIPS, H. M. *Basic education: a world challenge.* London, Wiley, 1975.

SHEFFIELD, J. R., and DIEJOMAOH, V. P. *Non-formal education in African development.* New York, African American Institute, 1972.

SIMKINS T. J. *Nonformal education and development.* Manchester, England, University of Manchester, Department of Adult and Higher Education, 1977 (Monograph 8).

SOUTH-EAST ASIAN MINISTERS OF EDUCATION ORGANIZATION (SEAMEO). *A study of nonformal education in the SEAMEO region 1973-1974.* Bangkok, Thailand, SEAMEO, 1974.

UNESCO. *The experimental World Literacy Programme: a critical assessment.* Paris, Unesco, 1976.

VELANDIA, Wilson, *et al. La educación noformal en Colombia: hacia un diagnostico de su realidad.* Bogotá, Colombia, Centro para desarrollo de la Educación Noformal, 1975.

WOOD, A. W. *Informal education and development in Africa.* The Hague, the Netherlands, The Institution of Social Studies, Mouton, 1974.

WORLD BANK. *Education: sector working paper.* Washington, D.C., World Bank, 1974.

Selected institutions active in nonformal education

Commonwealth Secretariat, Marlborough House, London SW1 Y5HX (United Kingdom)
The Commonwealth Youth Programme has published a series of detailed reports on youth programmes throughout the Commonwealth. These are available for purchase from the secretariat. Available reports are based on seminars in different regions of the world (Caribbean, 1970; Asia and the Pacific, 1971; Cyprus and Malta, 1972; Africa, 1969, 1975).

Center for International Education, University of Massachusetts, Hills House South, Amherst, Massachusetts 01003 (United States)
This centre produces a variety of documents in nonformal education, including 'Technical Notes', an ongoing series of book-length monographs on nonformal education, and a series entitled 'Issues in Nonformal Education'. All are available from the centre.

CREFAL (Centro Regional de Educación de Adultos y Alfabetización Funcional para América Latina), Patzcuaro, Michoacán (Mexico)
CREFAL serves as a regional training, research and documentation centre for Latin America. It serves in a co-ordinating function for materials and information dissemination as well as conducting training programmes for a wide range of education-related clientèles.

Institut International de Recherche et de Formation, Education et Développement, 49 Rue de la Glacière, 75013 Paris (France)
This institute has a long history of involvement in nonformal education and rural development, especially in francophone Africa. It publishes a number of documents.

International Council for Educational Development (ICED), P.O. Box 217, Essex, CT, 06426 (United States)
This research group has produced a well-known series of case studies and summary volumes since 1968. The results are available only from the publishers. See references to Coombs and Ahmed in 'Selected Basic References' above.

International Educational Reporting Service (IERS), International Bureau of Education, Palais Wilson, CH-1211, Geneva (Switzerland)
IERS is an information service focusing on innovations relevant to developing countries. The service publishes documents on a regular basis including indexes, abstracts, case studies and a newsletter. The service also responds to requests for information on specific topics.

International Institute for Adult Literacy Methods (IIALM), P.O. Box 1555, Tehran (Iran)
The IIALM is an international clearing-house on literacy and nonformal education methods, research and documentation. The institute publishes a quarterly journal and bibliographical bulletins, responds to

requests for information and actively disseminates information, especially on training for literacy workers.

International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), 7 Rue Eugène-Delacroix, Paris 76016 (France)

The institute publishes a lengthy list of papers and monographs relevant to the topic. Many of its documents are available upon request. Of particular interest in addition to the 'Fundamentals of Educational Planning' series are the series of papers listed under the heading 'Nonformal, Out-of-School, Adult and Rural Education'.

Program of Studies in Nonformal Education, Michigan State University, College of Education, East Lansing, Michigan 48824 (United States)

This programme has produced several series of documents on nonformal education. The sponsors also publish a series of discussion papers and a newsletter on nonformal education. They maintain an active resource centre and respond to requests for assistance.

World Education Incorporated, 1414 6th Avenue, New York, New York 10019 (United States)

This organization operates entirely in field project settings and has world-wide experience in materials development, staff training and programme implementation. It publishes a number of documents on nonformal education. Much of its work is done in the framework of family-life planning.

Since nonformal education is a relatively new field, the list of institutions involved in its study fluctuates rapidly. The list is incomplete, and the services of the institutions may not continue to be offered as described.

Newsletters

The following newsletters often contain materials on nonformal education and related activities around the world. To be put on their mailing lists, write to the sponsoring organizations.

Adult education information notes (available in English, French, Spanish)
Unesco, Adult Education Section, Place de Fontenoy, Paris 75700 (France)

ASPBAE Courier
Centre for Continuing Education, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 2600 (Australia)

Development communication report
Academy for Educational Development, 1414 22nd Street, N/W., Washington, D.C. 20037 (United States)

The nonformal education exchange
Information Center on Nonformal Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing. Michigan 48824 (United States)
World education reports
World Education Inc., 1414 6th Avenue, New York, New York 10019 (United States)

IIEP publications and documents

More than 500 titles on all aspects of educational planning have been published by the International Institute for Educational Planning. A comprehensive catalogue, giving details of their availability, includes research reports, case studies, seminar documents, training materials, occasional papers and reference books in the following subject categories:

Economics of education, costs and financing

Manpower and employment

Demographic studies

The location of schools and sub-national planning

Administration and management

Curriculum development and evaluation

Educational technology

Primary, secondary and higher education

Vocational and technical education

Non-formal, out-of-school, adult and rural education

Copies of the catalogue may be obtained from the IIEP on request.

The International Institute for Educational Planning

The International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) is an international centre for advanced training and research in the field of educational planning. It was established by Unesco in 1963 and is financed by Unesco and by voluntary contributions from individual Member States.

The Institute's aim is to contribute to the development of education throughout the world by expanding both knowledge and the supply of competent professionals in the field of educational planning. In this endeavour the Institute co-operates with interested training and research organizations in Member States. The Governing Board of the IIEP, which approves the Institute's programme and budget, consists of eight elected members and four members designated by the United Nations Organization and certain of its specialized agencies and institutes.

Chairman Malcom Adiseshiah (India), Vice-Chancellor, University of Madras; Director, Institute of Development Studies, Madras

Designated members Samir Amin, Director of Research, CODESRIA, Dakar
P. N. Dhar, Assistant Secretary-General for Research and Analysis, United Nations
T. Fülöp, Director, Division of Health Manpower Development, World Health Organization
Aklilu Habte, Director, Education Department, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development

Elected members Candido Mendes de Almeida (Brazil), Director, President of Foundation Sociedade Brasileira de Instruçao, Rio de Janeiro
Jean-Claude Eicher (France), Director, Institute for Research in the Economics of Education, University of Dijon
M. A. El-Rashid (Saudi Arabia), Director, Arab Bureau of Education and Culture for Gulf States, Riyadh
Michael Kinunda (Tanzania), Chief Administrative Officer, University of Dar-es-Salaam
Sippanondha Ketudat (Thailand), Minister of Education, Bangkok
Jan Szczepanski (Poland), Vice-President, Polish Academy of Sciences
Victor Urquidi (Mexico), Presidente, El Colegio de Mexico, Mexico

Inquiries about the Institute should be addressed to:
The Director, IIEP, 7-9, rue Eugène-Delacroix, 75916 Paris

The book

Nonformal education poses a challenging problem for educational planners. What is included in this field? What purposes can and should it serve? Can it be planned, and if so, how? As a newly recognised area of education, being given increased attention and resources, nonformal education must in some way be incorporated into the competency areas of educational planners. This study provides a basic framework for understanding the field today, and outlines some initial strategies for incorporating it into the overall efforts of educational planners. The topic is timely because it coincides with a growing awareness that development in education and in general can proceed only so far as a centrally controlled and planned enterprise. Beyond that point, there must be an increased level of involvement and commitment on the part of the clientèle. Nonformal education provides a potential mechanism for an educational response to this thrust.

The author

David R. Evans is a faculty member in the School of Education and the Director of the Center for International Education at the University of Massachusetts. He has been involved actively in international education since the early 1960s and during the 1970s has been both teaching about nonformal education and directing a number of nonformal education field projects.

ISBN 92-803-1082-8